

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV.

SEPTEMBER, 1903.

NO. 4.

A Review of Essentials

THE zeal of the new convert is proverbial—his energy, his interest in novel surroundings, his impatience for results, his final realization and philosophical acceptance of the fact that "Rome was not built in a day," and then if he is made of the right stuff, his grim determination to settle down for a long, hard fight. There are few of the tried workers in the Socialist movement who have not passed along this road. In the enthusiasm following their discovery of what they considered a panacea for the ills of society they have plunged into propaganda and proclaimed in a mighty voice the glad new tidings. They have expected all those who love their kind to pause entranced at the sweetness of the new song. They have expected the oppressors of the poor to stand at first appalled when their infamy was proclaimed in the market place and then flee in confusion and dismay into the darkness of oblivion. Then, slowly, the light begins to break in upon the new convert. He learns the bitter lesson that the world has no particular interest in abstract justice, that the electorate doesn't generally vote "yes" or "no" on the simple right or wrong of a given policy. This lesson learned, the convert, if he is persistent, begins to re-examine his ground—his Socialist philosophy—and discovers some of the meaning of "economic determinism," realizes that it is a mighty hard proposition to hurry evolution. Once these things are realized the Socialist movement has a valuable worker, a veteran who, while not despising the advantage of the moment, knows it is more important to emerge victorious from the war than to win an isolated battle.

There is another type of Socialist recruit almost equally familiar. This is the "reform" politician who has expended time and energy, voice and money, in pushing the movements whose

bleaching bones strew the political battlefield. He has been able to arouse great enthusiasm; he has swept certain sections like a prairie fire; he has won victories and captured public powers, only to see his fond hope for humanity go glimmering. Undismayed and with beautiful courage he has sought the reason for his failure, determined, when it was found, to push on again. He has decided his weakness was in a mistaken apprehension of the exact cause of economic, political and social evils. He has said it was this, that or the other, only to fail, and now he has embraced with enthusiasm the Socialist position—or at least that part of it which indicts the wages system as the basic cause of poverty in the midst of plenty, serfdom in a "sweet land of liberty." Apprehending so much the reformer buckles on his harness again and sallies forth, determined to "whoop 'em up" and "set the woods afire" with his new battle cry. He is an experienced politician, familiar with the most approved methods of generating enthusiasm, he expects to work up "the people," go lickety split to Washington and usher in the Co-operative Commonwealth with a "hip, hip, hurrah."

The reform politician—(no reproach in the word "politician," for he is a good fellow)—hasn't had opportunity yet to fail on his new tack, but the old Socialist—the believer in evolution and economic determinism—knows that failure is as sure as death. And the old Socialist, even if he makes himself disliked by saving it, must utter his warning cry and proclaim the necessity for adherence to the classical Socialist position—a position taken after a critical study of all history by master minds, a position which has proved impregnable through fifty years of bitterest assault.

As eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, so is a clear comprehension of the essentials of Socialist philosophy an absolute necessity in the minds of the governing power in the Socialist party—the majority of the membership. It is only by a knowledge of what it is fighting for, a knowledge of the historic means by which social changes are effected, that the party can achieve its great mission, avoiding the pitfalls of an alluring opportunism and the traps set by a crafty, resourceful and unscrupulous enemy. With a rapidly swelling party membership it becomes a matter of vital importance that the recruits understand the conditions of the fight they are to wage. A sane conservatism must see to it that neither the new convert, impatient for results, nor the reform politician, with an unassimilated knowledge of Socialist essentials, is allowed to dominate party councils or direct party activities. This must be done from motives of common prudence and with absolutely no reflection upon the honesty or capacity of the friends who come bringing to us rich gifts of mind and heart.

All our civilization has not been able to eradicate that human credulity which is always looking for the miracle, that impatience which chafes under the slow operation of natural laws. We see the trait in the faith curist, who, disdaining the accumulated knowledge of the centuries regarding the treatment of disease, jumps with avidity at a theory according to which it is only necessary to say Presto! and that which was is not. There are other amiable "new thought" people to whom the process of ratiocination is too slow and who spend long hours prayerfully contemplating the ends of their noses in order that they may cultivate a power higher than mind and reach conclusions independent of the syllogism. But in spite of these amiable people the world is not yet ready to cut loose from logical, scientific methods and substitute for law, ascertained by painful investigation, a supernaturalism whose sacred word is abracadabra.

The type of mind which these credulous supernaturalists exemplify is restive under the restraint of cautious science, but its impatience cannot make us forget that according to our scientific Socialism social changes are accomplished in a certain way.

We believe that the "history of mankind has been a history of class struggles" and that men as a rule have fought on one side or the other to serve their immediate material interests. Any other than the economic interpretation of history is as archaic and useless as the theory of special creation and it must necessarily be the key to our interpretation of contemporary events and the basis of our party organization. Never before were the great classes in conflict so clearly defined and never before was the necessity so urgent for a strict adherence to the class struggle plan of campaign. It is not mere dogmatism to assert and insist upon this. It is only a recognition of scientifically ascertained facts—facts which cannot be safely ignored or declaimed away by advocates of an invertebrate philosophy of universal brotherhood. Of course we all concede the essential unity of the human race and the desirability of harmony in social relations, but as "fine words butter no parsnips," so do platitudes about fraternity fail to advance the day of peace on earth. Humankind is arrayed in hostile camps, and if we want peace we've got to fight for it—the class struggle must be waged to its logical conclusion before the final emancipation of "society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles."

As hard and as cold as these facts may be—and science is never alluring to the sentimental temperament—they are not inconsistent with a liberal and enlightened propaganda. They have never and need not in the future keep from us individuals, who, though their immediate material interests are with the capitalist class, are yet able to judge the trend of events and desire to fight

for the cause which means a larger liberty, comfort and happiness for the race. History is irradiated by the example of men who have battled, and suffered if necessary, for the abstract ideal of justice. The Socialist movement today owes much to these men of education and ideals, but their usefulness is largely due to the promptness with which they apprehend the fact of the class struggle and the faithfulness with which they adhere to their perception of scientific truth.

It would be idle to deny that there are differences in the Socialist movement today as to the wisdom of certain features of organization and methods of propaganda. It is unfortunate, of course, that these differences should bring from the adherent of this or that idea vigorous statement and heated retort, but most of us philosophically recognize that we can't have perfection, even in debates between Socialists, in this sadly imperfect world of ours. However, we can insist that every proposition advanced for the good of the movement be judged according to its harmony with our fundamental principles and demand of all more than a mere lip recognition of the essentially proletarian character of our movement. The cry for "American methods for an American movement" is all right in so far as it takes into account our peculiar political conditions, but there can no more be a distinctive "American Socialism" than there can be an "American mathematics." American human nature is just like European human nature and the law of economic determinism rules in the United States just as surely as it rules in the countries of the old world. So the conclusion is irresistible that when the cry for "American methods for an American movement" is not merely an expression of the restiveness of the impatient recruit it is either disingenuous or the evidence of a chauvinism absurd in the light of our boasted internationalism.

One sometimes hears the sneer that some Socialists are "afraid the movement will get too big," and there are proposals that the so-called "military character" of the movement be abandoned. Of course no one fears bigness when bigness means solidity, but we may well fear and fight against the bigness which represents mere hot air which will vanish at the prick of a pin. The so-called "military character" of the movement, in so far as that means a pledged and dues-paying membership, is our tower of strength, and proposals that the party "simply pledge to everybody, and to everybody alike, the collective ownership and democratic management of industry" is the crass Utopianism of a sanguine camp-meeting exhorter who imagines the movement can be adequately supported by inviting the brethren to step up to the contribution box. We must have organization, and a well disciplined organization at that. We can't achieve or eat the fruit of victory with

a mob. The Socialist party organization, in giving to every member a voice in the discussion and settlement of questions of policy, cultivates individual initiative and that capacity for self-government which is showing many signs of atrophy under the so-called representative, but rather machine, system. A membership thus actively participating in party affairs is the strongest bulwark against the ever threatening political vampires—the tricksters, bosses and grafters—seeking a new and vigorous body whose blood they may suck. It has proved its efficiency by standing fast in many a storm that threatened to destroy the party and there is no evidence of its incapacity to settle right present and future problems. There have always been well intentioned men who have thought they could do better for the people than the people could do for themselves, but that is the theory of benevolent despotism—of theocracy, not democracy—and we want none of it. We shall have—we already have—honest, astute, and masterful men whose influence will intensify the effectiveness of our efforts, but it is a delusion to think that we are sheep without a shepherd, a helpless mass waiting for some Moses to lead us out of the wilderness. The working class must emancipate itself, and while it welcomes the assistance of all those “in sympathy with it,” the Socialists at least entertain no delusions and must prepare for the work ahead as prudent, practical men.

CHARLES DOBBS.

Some Phases of Civilization

IN AN article written by Frederick Harrison, originally published in *The Fortnightly Review*, for April, 1882, entitled "A Few Words about the Nineteenth Century," I find the following:

"In one of those delightful tales of Voltaire, which nobody reads now, I remember how the King of Babylon cured of excessive self-esteem a great satrap called Irax. The moment he awoke in the morning the master of the royal music entered the favorite's chamber with a full chorus and orchestra, and performed in his honor a cantata which lasted two hours; and every third minute there was a refrain to this effect:

"Que son mérite est extrême!
Que de grâces! que de grandeur!
Ah! combien Monseigneur
Doit être content de lui-même!"

The cantata over, a royal chamberlain advanced and pronounced a harangue that lasted three-quarters of an hour, in which he extolled him for possessing all the good qualities which he had not. At dinner, which lasted three hours, the same ceremonial was continued. If he opened his mouth to speak, the first chamberlain said: 'Hark! we shall hear wisdom!' And before he had uttered four words, the second chamberlain said: 'What wisdom do we hear!' Then the third and the fourth chamberlain broke into shouts of laughter over the good things which Irax had said, or rather ought to have said; and after dinner the same cantata was again sung in his honor. On the first day Irax was delighted; the second he found less pleasant; on the third he was bored; on the fourth he said he could bear it no longer; and on the fifth he was cured.

"I sometimes think this (the nineteenth) century, with its material progress and its mechanical inventions, its steam and electricity, gas, and patents, is being treated by the press, and its other public admirers, much as the chamberlains in *Zadig* treated the satrap. The century is hardly awake of a morning before thousands of newspapers, speeches, lectures and essays appear at its bedside, or its breakfast table, repeating as in chorus:

"Que son mérite est extrême!
Que de grâces! que de grandeur!"

"Surely no century in all human history was ever so much

praised to its face for its wonderful achievements, its wealth and its power, its unparalleled ingenuity and its miraculous capacity for making itself comfortable and generally enjoying life. British associations, and all sorts of associations, economic, scientific and mechanical, are perpetually executing cantatas in honor of the age of progress, cantatas which (alas) last much longer than three hours. The gentlemen who perform wonderful unsavory feats in crowded lecture halls, always remind us that 'Never was such a time as this nineteenth century!' Public men laying the first stone of institutes, museums, or amusing the Royal Academy after dinner, great inventors, who have reaped fortunes and titles, raise up their hands and bless us in the benignity of affluent old age. I often think of Lord Sherbrook, in his new robes and coronet, as the first chamberlain, bowing and crying out, 'What a noble age is this!' The journals perform the part of orchestra, banging big drums and blowing trumpets—penny trumpets, two-penny, three-penny or six-penny trumpets—and the speakers before or after dinner, and the gentlemen who read papers in the sections perform the part of chorus, singing in unison:

'Ah! combien Monseigneur
Doit être content de lui-même!'

"As a mere mite in this magnificent epoch, I ask myself, What have I done, and many plain people around me, who have no mechanical genius at all, what have we done to deserve this perpetual cataract of congratulation? All that I can think of is the assurance that Figaro gives the count, 'our lordship gave ourselves the trouble to be born in it!'

"It is worth a few minutes' thought to ask what is the exact effect upon *civilization*, in the widest and highest sense of that term, of this marvelous multiplication of mechanical appliances of life? This is a very wide question, and takes us to the roots of many matters, social, economic, political, moral, and even religious. Is the universal use of a mechanical process *per se* a great gain to civilization, an unmixed gain—a gain without dangers or drawback? Is an age which abounds in countless inventions thereby alone placed head and shoulders above all the ages since historical times began? And this brings us to the point that the answer to the question largely depends on what we mean by civilization. We need not attempt to define *civilization*. Before any one can fully show the meaning of civilization, he must see in a very clear way what is his own ideal of a high, social, moral and religious life, and this is not the place to enter on any such solemn, not to say tremendous, topic.

"Let us hail the triumphs of steam, and electricity, and gas, and iron; the railways and the commerce; the industry, the appli-

ances, and conveniences of our age. They are all destined to do good service to humanity. But still it is worth asking if the good they do is *quite* so vast, *quite* so unmixed, *quite* so immediate as the chamberlains and chorus make out in their perpetual cantata to the nineteenth century.

"Let us note some of the mechanical glories of the last hundred years, as they are so often rehearsed. For four thousand years we know, and probably forty thousand years, man has traveled over the land as fast as his own legs, or men's legs, or horses' legs could carry him, but no faster; over sea as fast as sails and oars could carry him. Now he goes by steam over both at least at three times the pace. In previous ages, possibly for twenty centuries, about a hundred miles a day was the outside limit of any long continuous journey. Now we can go four thousand miles by sea in fourteen days, and by land in five days. It used to occupy as many weeks, or sometimes months. We have now instantaneous communication with all parts of the globe. The whole surface of our planet has only been known about a hundred years, and till our own day to get news from all parts of it to one given spot would certainly have required a year. The president of the United States delivers his message, and within three hours newspapers in all parts of the world have printed it word for word. For twenty thousand years every fabric in use has been twisted into thread by human fingers, and woven into stuff by human hands. Machines and steam engines now make ten thousand shirts in the time that was formerly occupied by making one. For twenty thousand years man has got no better light than what was given by pitch, tallow or oil. He now has gas and electricity, each light of which is equal to hundreds and thousands of candles. Where there used to be a few hundred books there are now one hundred thousand; and the London newspapers of a single year consume, I dare say, more type and paper than the printing of the whole world produced from the days of Gutenberg to the French Revolution.

"The Victorian age had a thousand times the resources of any other age. Permit me to ask, Does it use them to a thousand times better purpose? I am no detractor of our own age. * * * We all feel, in spite of a want of beauty, of rest, of completeness, which sits heavy on our souls and frets the thoughtful spirit—we all feel a-tiptoe with hope and confidence. * * *

"Civilization is a very elastic, impalpable, indefinable thing. But where are we to turn to find the tremendous relative superiority of 1882 over 1782, or 1682, or 1582? We may hunt up and down, and we shall only find this: Population doubling itself almost with every generation—cities swelling year by year by millions of inhabitants and square miles of area—*wealth counted by billions*, power to go anywhere, or learn anything, or order

anything, counted in seconds of time—miraculous means of locomotion, of transportation, of copying anything, of detecting the billionth part of a grain or a hair's breadth, of seeing millions of billions of miles into space and finding more stars, billions of letters carried every year by the post, billions of men and women whirled everywhere in hardly any time at all; a sort of patent fairy-Peribanou's fan which we can open and flutter, and straightway find everything and anything the planet contains for about half a crown; night turned into day; roads cut through the bowels of the earth, and canals across continents; every wish for any material thing gratified in mere conjuror's fashion, by the turning a handle or adjusting a pipe—an enchanted world, where everything does what we tell it in perfectly inexplicable ways, as if some good Prospero were waving his hand, and electricity were the willing Ariel—that is what we have—and yet, *is this civilization?* Do our philosophy, our science, our art, our manners, our happiness, our morality, overtop the philosophy, the science, the art, the manners, the happiness, the morality of our grandfathers as greatly as those of cultivated Europeans differed from those of savages? We are as much superior in material appliances to the men of Milton's day and Newton's day as they were to Afghans or Zulus. Are we equally superior in cultivation of brain and character to the contemporaries of Milton and Newton? * * *

"Why is it that we don't get any farther? Because we know that Shakespeare got to the root of the matter of tragedy quite as deep as Mr. Irving. No one can call Pope or Addison, Voltaire or Montesquieu, wanting in culture. No one can deny that Milton had a fine style and a fine taste; no one can say that Johnson, Congreve, Dryden, Pope, Fielding, Reynolds and Charles James Fox passed narrow, stunted, dull lives. And yet the tools, the appliances, the conveniences of these men's lives were, in comparison with ours, as the tools, appliances and conveniences of the ancient Britons or the South Sea islanders were to theirs. Why, then, with all this arsenal of appliances, do we not do more? Can it be that we are overwhelmed with our appliances, bewildered by our resources, puzzled with our mass of materials, by the mere opportunities we have of going everywhere, seeing everything, and doing anything?

"When we multiply the appliances of human life, we do not multiply the years of life, nor the days in the year, nor the hours in the day. Nor do we multiply the powers of thought, or of endurance; much less do we multiply self-restraint, unselfishness, and a good heart. What we really multiply are our difficulties and doubts. Millions of new books hardly help us when we can neither read nor remember a tithe of what we have. Billions of

new facts rather confuse men who do not know what to do with the old facts. Culture, thought, art, ease, and grace of manner, a healthy society, and a higher standard of life, have often been found without any of our modern resources in a state of very simple material equipment.

"Steam and factories, telegraphs, posts, railways, gas, coal and iron, suddenly discharged from a country as if by a deluge, have their own evils that they bring in their train. To cover whole countries with squalid buildings, to pile up one hundred thousand factory chimneys, vomiting soot, to fill the air with poisonous vapors till every leaf within ten miles is withered, to choke up rivers with putrid refuse, to turn tracts as big and once as lovely as the New Forest into arid, noisome wastes; cinder-heaps, cesspools, coal-dust, and rubbish—rubbish, coaldust, cess pools and cinder-heaps, and overhead by day and by night a murky pall of smoke—all this is not an heroic achievement, if this Black Country is only to serve as a prison yard for the men, women and children who dwell there.

"To bury Middlesex and Surrey under miles of flimsy houses, crowd into them millions and millions of overworked, underfed, half-taught and often squalid men and women; to turn the silver Thames into the biggest sewer recorded in history; to leave us all to drink the sewerage water; to breathe the carbonized air; to be closed up in a labyrinth of dull, sooty, unwholesome streets; to leave hundreds and thousands confined there, with gin, and bad air, and hard work, and low wages, breeding contagious diseases and sinking into despair of soul and feebler condition of body; and then to sing pæans and shout, because the ground shakes and the air is shrill with the roar of infinite engines and machines, because the black streets are lit up with garish gas-lamps, and more garish electric lamps, and the postoffice carries billions of letters, and the railways every day carry one hundred thousand persons in and out of the huge factory, we call the greatest metropolis of the civilized world—this is surely not the last word of civilization.

"Something like a million of paupers are kept year by year from absolute starvation by doles; at least another million of poor people are on the border-line, fluttering between starvation and health, between pauperism and independence; not one, but two, or three, or four millions of people in these islands are struggling on the minimum pittance of human comforts and the maximum of human labor; something like twenty millions are raised each year by taxation of intoxicating liquors; something like one hundred thousand deaths each year of diseases distinctly preventable by care and sufficient food and sanitary precautions and due self-restraint; infants dying off from want of good nursing like flies;

families herded together like swine, eating, drinking, sleeping, fighting, dying in the same close and foul den; the kicking to death of wives, the strangling of babies, the drunkenness, the starvation, the mendacity, the prostitution, the thieving, the cheating, the pollution of our vast cities in masses, waves of misery and vice, chaos and neglect—all this counted, not here and there in spots and sores (as such things in human society always will be), but in areas larger than the entire London of Elizabeth, masses of population equal to the entire English people of her age. I will sum it up in words not my own, but written the other day by one of our best and most acute living teachers, who says: 'Our present type of society is in many respects one of the most horrible that has ever existed in the world's history—boundless luxury and self-indulgence at the one end of the scale, and at the other a condition of life as cruel as that of a Roman slave, and more degraded than that of a South Sea islander.' Such is another refrain to the cantata of the nineteenth century, and its magnificent achievements in industry, science and art.

"What is the good of carrying millions of people through the bowels of the earth, and at fifty miles an hour, if millions of working people are forced to live in dreary, black suburbs, miles and miles away from all the freshness of the country, and away miles and miles even from the life and intelligence of cities? What is the good of ships like moving towns, that cross the Atlantic in a week, and are as gorgeous within as palaces, if they sweep millions of our poor who find nothing but starvation at home? What is the use of electric lamps, and telephones and telegraphs, newspapers by millions, letters by billions, if seamstresses stitching their fingers to the bone can hardly earn fourpence by making a shirt, and many a man and woman is glad of a shilling for twelve hours' work? What do we all gain if in covering our land with factories and steam engines we are covering it also with want and wretchedness? And if we can make a shirt for a penny and a coat for sixpence, and bring bread from every market on the planet, what do we gain if they who make the coat and the shirt lead the lives of galley slaves, and eat their bread in tears and despair, disease and filth.

"We are all in the habit of measuring success by *products*, whilst the point is, how are the products consumed, and by whom, and what sort of lives are passed by the producers? So far as mechanical improvements pour more wealth into the lap of the wealthy, more luxury into the lives of the luxurious, and give a fresh turn to the screw which presses on the lives of the poor; so far as our inventions double and treble the power of the rich, and double and treble the helplessness of the poor, giving to him that hath, and taking away from him that hath not even that

which he has—so far these great material appliances of life directly tend to lower civilization, retard it, distort, and deprave it. And they *do* this, so far as we spend most of our time in extending and enjoying these appliances, and very little time in preparing for the new conditions of life they impose upon us, and in remedying the horrors that they bring in their train.

"Socially, morally and intellectually speaking, an era of extraordinary changes is an age that has cast on it quite exceptional duties. A child might as well play with a steam engine or an electric machine as we could prudently accept our material triumphs with a mere 'rest and be thankful.' To decry steam and electricity, inventions and products, is hardly more foolish than to deny the price which civilization itself has to pay for the use of them. *There are forces at work now, forces more unwearied than steam, and brighter than the electric arc, to rehumanize the dehumanized members of society; to assert the old immutable truths; to appeal to the old indestructible instinct; to recall beauty; forces yearning for rest, grace, and harmony; rallying all that is organic in man's nature, and proclaiming the value of spiritual life over material life.* But there never was a century in human history when these forces had a field so vast before them, or issues so momentous on their failure or success. There never was an age when the need was so urgent for synthetic habits of thought, systematic education, and a common moral and religious faith.

"There is much to show that our better genius is awakened to the task. Stupefied with smoke, and stunned with steam whistles, there was a moment when the century listened with equanimity to the vulgarest of flatterers. But if machinery were really the last word, we should be rushing violently down a steep place, like the herd of swine."

A few words from R. Heber Newton, from the Arena, January, 1902:

"Labor strikes have tended to end, as in Homestead, in the revolver and the bomb.

"Manufacturers have not hesitated to dispense with the arm of the law and to hire the *condottiere* of our modern civilization, the Pinkerton police.

"Railroads have ignored laws for the protection of life among their employes.

"Corporate wealth has high-handedly bade defiance to law, crushed recklessly all competition by thoroughly anarchistic methods, and not stopped short of corrupting legislatures.

"Out on Long Island life is daily endangered by a high-handed defiance of the laws regulating the speed of vehicles on

the part of rich men, whose automobiles terrorize horses and drivers alike.

"While such practical anarchism prevails, we must not wonder at anarchistic assassinations. While lawlessness is found everywhere, and *ordinary* life is held so lightly, we must expect lawless disregard of *exceptional* lives."

Had this article been written later he might have included the beef combine, to monopolize meats—one of the necessities of life—and the "divinely appointed" coal combine, to manipulate and control another necessity, and demonstrate to the millions of humanity that it holds inexorably in its hands the right, "divine right," to freeze us.

I wish to call attention to one other writer, Theodore D. Wolssey, D.D., LL.D., ex-president of Yale College, and author of "Political Science;" "Introduction to the Study of International law;" "Communism and Socialism."

In the last named work, written in 1879, about three years prior to the article of Mr. Harrison, above quoted from, how like a prophet he speaks when he says: "If, however, that to which we have referred already more than once should be found to be a law of social progress—that the free use of private property must end in making a *few* capitalists of *enormous* wealth and a *vast* proportion of *laborers* dependent upon them; and if there could be no choice between *this disease* of free society and the swallowing up of all property by the state—then, we admit, it would be hard to choose between the two evils. Nothing would lead the mass of men to embrace Socialism sooner than the conviction that this enormous accumulation of capital in a few hands was to be not only *an evil in fact*, if not prevented, but a *necessary evil*, beyond prevention. We have no desire to see a return to the time of the '*latifundia*,' or broad farms, which, as Pliny and Elder said, were the ruin of Italy. If such a tendency should manifest itself, it would run through all the forms of property. A Stewart or a Claflin would root out smaller tradespeople. Holders of small farms would sink into tenants. The buildings of a city would belong to a few owners. Small manufacturers would have to take pay from mammoths of their own kind or be ruined. Then would the words of the prophet be fulfilled: 'Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place that they may be placed alone in the earth.' For if it went to an extreme in a free country, the '*expropriated*' could not endure it. They would go to some other country, and leave these proprietors alone in the land, or would drive them away. A *revolution, slow or rapid, would certainly bring about a new order of things.*"

Now for over twenty years (since the above was written)

we have been waiting for this promised improvement, we have been hoping against hope, and what do we see? Any of the promised restraints by legal enactments; any amelioration of the condition of the wage-earning people?

Is it not rather that there are more millionaires, more gigantic combines, and more lawlessness among this class; that every legislative body, national, state and municipal, has its powerful lobby that usually gets all that it asks for for its friends? Is it not that it becomes a little harder for the laborer—either mental or physical—to “make both ends meet;” that employment is becoming a little more uncertain? Is it not that the once great middle class is being swept from among men and is dropping into the class of wage-earners—no man now, of moderate means, can invest his funds in any legitimate business and pay expenses in competition with the trusts, even if they let him alone. Is it not that the army of employed, those that would willingly work, is becoming daily larger; that the cost of living is advancing at a rapid rate, far in advance of the pittance of advance in wages, where any advance is conceded? Is it not that food stuff, as it advances in price, deteriorates in quality until it is often actually dangerous to take into a human stomach?

Verily the time prophesied by the good doctor has arrived when “we must go to some other country, * * * or drive them away.”

The “divine” coal combine, through their Christ, suggests that the federal government should give an island to the Socialists where they could go and invent Socialistic schemes. This is magnanimous, to say the least, and worthy of the brain that evolved it. But, let us ask, where is this island? The Socialists are already numbered by the millions; are casting votes by the millions all over the world; there is no island on this earth large enough to contain one-tenth part of us. Would it not be more expeditious and more economical for the federal government to *give* an island to the capitalists where they could go and exploit themselves and cease exploiting labor? A very small island would contain them all.

There being so many Socialists in all countries that they cannot “go to some other country,” then the only ready remedy suggested by Dr. Wolsey is to “drive them away.” But we will be more magnanimous than he—we will let them remain where they are. We are not asking for the gift of islands that are already ours; we are asking that the government take over some of the property that belongs to it, to *all the people*, now controlled by trusts and combines, and use it for the benefit of all the people to whom it belongs, instead of for the benefit of the few and the oppression of the many. Our motto is a government “of the

people, by the people, and for the people," instead of a government "of the people, by the rascals, for the rich."

"I affirm it is my conviction that class laws, *placing capital above labor*, are more dangerous to the public at this hour than chattel slavery in the days of its haughtiest supremacy. *Labor is prior to and above capital*, and **DESERVES A MUCH HIGHER CONSIDERATION.**"—*Abraham Lincoln.*

"The trusts of today are the revival in industrial life of exactly the same spirit that created absolutism in states. Formerly men aimed at *administrative absolutism*; now the trust leaders' object is the attainment of *financial absolutism*.

"It is as pernicious in its latter day as in its former aspect, and *it is as vital to the interests of humanity and progress that financial absolutism SHOULD BE DESTROYED as it was that absolutism among rulers should be ABOLISHED.*

"The whole history of Anglo-Saxon civilization has been the history of a steady, tenacious fight against absolutism in the state, a fight which has been entirely successful. *Financial absolutism must be fought, and, in my opinion, the influences that will fight and overcome it will be that same Anglo-Saxon civilization which has CRUSHED ABSOLUTISM IN OTHER FORMS.*"—*Benjamin Kidd.*

The haughty, dictatorial conduct of the "divine" combine in the late coal strike to the governor of the state of New York, to the president of the United States, to the commission appointed to hear and arbitrate, tells us only too plainly the position of combined capital today. It is not only imperialistic, but assumes the position of absolutism. "*The earth is mine,*" and "*if you do not like me and my ways, all you have to do is simply to 'get off the earth.'*"

The "revolution" predicted by Dr. Wolsey is now here and certainly will "bring about a new order of things."

When Socialism prevails, and there is no other adequate remedy, we will have "changed cars for Paradise," at least for an earthly paradise.

IRA C. MOSHER.

Value and the Distribution of Commodities

That which determines how much of other commodities can be gotten for a certain quantity of a given commodity in a free market unaffected by monopoly or force or fraud is its value.

It is apparent that the better the commodity the greater its value and the greater its quantity the greater its value. That is to say in general of a quantity of a commodity compared with another quantity of the same that its value is greater if its usefulness is greater, and vice versa. It is accordingly easy and natural to draw the false conclusion that the value of an article depends upon its usefulness and is determined by the people's desire for it. A thing must be useful in order to be valuable; but nothing is valuable merely because it is useful. A thing more particularly and generally useful than water can hardly be mentioned. Yet water is without value where no one has to work to get it. It may be remarked just here that it requires more labor to make a good article, a good crop of corn for instance, than to make a poor one. It requires more labor to make more of a commodity. If it did not, if a good crop could be made without more labor than the poor crop, the poor crop would not be made at all. It is sure, therefore, if some of a commodity is better than another lot of the same, more labor is generally consumed to make it. The advance in value of one over the other has been preceded by an advance in the labor usually consumed. If comparison be possible, how much more useful is bread than gold, yet how much less valuable, because the labor of production of the latter is greater. If one picks up luckily a nugget of gold, his labor does not fix the average expended for our supply of gold.

Anything usually made for sale is a commodity; but it is impossible to compare the values of these things on the basis of their relative usefulness and people's desire for them. It is as irrational to try to measure the usefulness of iron with the usefulness of bread or of gold as to attempt to measure distance in pounds or temperature in feet. They are no more comparable.

Corn is not sold for corn or beef for beef or gold for gold. Commodities are sold for others not for the same generally. On what do the quantity of other commodities which can be gotten for a certain quantity of a given commodity depend in a free market? In other words, what is value? Where it is shown that no constant consistent relation can be between two things, the one cannot depend upon the other. One article is not worth more than another because it weighs more or because its volume

is greater. It can readily be shown by an indefinite number of instances that the values of commodities do not vary according to their relative weight, size, color, or any other physical properties. There can be no relation whatever between the values of commodities and their physical properties. Therefore there is no dependence one upon the other. Of all these properties combined the usefulness is made up. The value often does increase through scarcity, whereas the usefulness is less. Value falls where the usefulness has increased in many instance. A certain amount of labor will make now 35 times as many watches, 22 times as much wheat, 4,000 times as many screw posts, 111 times as many pairs of hose as it would without improved machinery fifty or sixty years ago. The products are better than the old. They are not accordingly more valuable. While a few would be sufficient, a multitude of illustrations could be found to show that there is no law of dependence of value upon usefulness and the desire for them. All commodities are alike the products of human labor. They are not exchanged in relative quantities according to their physical properties. We cannot compare their relative usefulness or people's desire for them. But we can measure the amount of human labor which society must expend to provide them; and there is a perfectly obvious and constant relation between the value of commodities and the labor of their production. The greater the labor of production of the commodity the greater its value, and the less the labor the less its value. The quantities of other commodities which can be gotten for a certain quantity of a particular commodity vary directly in a free market with the average amount of useful labor necessary to provide this commodity. This is the law of gravitation of commodities.

Averages are such elastic quantities and the average labor of society so particularly uncertain of close measurement, it is objected that such a basis as the above conclusion is dangerous for far reaching and important deductions. The conception of value presupposes the existence of a community or of a society. Where there is not the exchange of goods there is no such thing conceivable as value. Where there is the exchange of goods we have at least the beginnings of a community. Society values its supply of iron as much more or as much less than its supply of wheat as the labor of making its iron is more or less than the labor necessary to make society's supply of wheat. If society is obliged to expend twice as much labor to produce its supply of wheat as to produce its supply of iron, one billionth part of its wheat supply, suppose twenty bushels, would be valued twice as much as one billionth part of its supply of iron, say one ton. The value of commodities is seen to be society's labor to produce them.

For the measurement of length we take something having

length. And so for the measurement of value we take something having value, a commodity, and compare others with it. Anything with which society is supplied by human effort may be made the standard, money. Some of the things used have been very curious, cattle, beads, tobacco, slaves. Most convenient, because of the great amount of consumed human labor carried in the small bulk, are the precious metals. It is found convenient to have the money metal made into pieces of regular weight with the denomination stamped thereon—coin. So the human labor usually consumed in producing a few pennyweight of gold is made the standard for measuring the labor in other commodities. That commodity which is sought everywhere in exchange for other commodities and generally accepted as a universal equivalent of value is money. It is exceedingly undesirable to have a changing standard for measurement, as it would be exceedingly inconvenient to use a foot rule that varied in length, sometimes more and sometimes less than one foot. The use of a commodity as standard of value has therefore its disadvantages, since all commodities fluctuate in value with the changes in the labor of their production. Moreover, any commodity can be cornered, gaining thereby a temporary fictitious value. Government credit makes it possible to circulate stamped paper in place of this money commodity, while the public are confident of its exchange for the precious metal or other commodities. The basis of government credit is its power to tax the nation's industries. The standard of value might more reasonably be the average labor of a day than the average labor consumed in a certain weight of gold. The labor certificates, money, of an industrial democracy controlling the industries of the people would be less liable to depreciation than the negotiable paper now in circulation from our banks and other financial institutions and from the government itself.

That value is labor is not inconsistent with its being offered in any of its multitudinous forms, generally in money as the means of payment, for things which in the nature of them could not involve the consumption of society's labor for their production. Things which may be offered directly or indirectly as an inducement to labor come to possess a value as great as the labor they can induce.

Change in the demand for or the supply of a commodity so invariably precedes the fluctuation in its price and is so noticeable that it is rightly considered to be the immediate cause of the change in price and falsely understood to determine the value. Value is determined by the law of supply and demand, it is said. We have no controversy with these people, but let us ask them what determines the supply and demand. When the price for the time being is constant, supply and demand just balance each

other. One nullifies the effect of the other. What causes them to just balance at this price?

People are moved by an infinite variety of motives. The motive for work is to get the necessities first, and then the luxuries and refinements of life, and the gratification of that infinite variety of human desires which the labor of society can directly or indirectly, wholly or in part, gratify. In a community making commodities men don't make shoes to wear themselves. They make goods for the consumption of others, because it seems to each that his effort expended in this way will better gain the object of his desires than in any other that he can command. In a better industrial order men may find the motive for their work more largely in the love of it. From the same motives that individuals seek the greatest results for their labor, society buys in the cheapest market.

It frequently happens that change in the conditions of production so increase the labor necessary to turn out a certain quantity of product that the same labor cannot turn out nearly so much as before. The supply is short. Some who have expected to buy as usual at the old price, must go without or give more that they who sell may prefer to sell them. The value is advanced by the action of the law of supply and demand with the increase of the labor necessary. Or through an opposite change in the conditions of production, better crop conditions perhaps, or improved machinery, a certain amount of labor produces more product than before. The supply is now greater than the usual demand at the old price. Some must sell for less to sell at all. The commodity will be consumed where it would not have been consumed at the old price. The value falls through the action of the law of supply and demand with the decrease in the necessary labor of production. The price becomes constant again when adjusted so that supply and demand balance each other. The change in value is according to the change in the labor necessary; for this balance of supply against demand cannot continue if a given amount of labor expended in this kind of production or service gets much better or much worse pay and conditions of life, than the same effort expended in other employments. The entrance of the capitalist into the process complicates it without changing the result. He is at least as jealous of his profits as the laborer is of his wages, and can transfer his investment almost as readily as the worker can change his job.

Quite reasonably should we expect in the chaotic conditions of the perpetual financial war now prevailing, where no intelligence whatever can be devoted to the distribution of the productive labor of society, according to the various needs of society, that with one kind of goods the market will be flooded while the supply of an-

other commodity is so far short of the demand that some people will prefer to pay much more than the price due to the labor necessary in its production, rather than be inconvenienced by the lack of it.

Let us suppose that a premium is offered on the production of a commodity above the normal value because of an increase in demand which occurs without increase in the labor of production. The conditions of production of practically all commodities permit the processes to be hastened to meet unusual demand by the application of unusual labor. But the remuneration offered must be at least as great as the usual labor which must be consumed. It is not now a matter of making corn or iron or paper or some other commodity under the ordinary processes of production, but of forcing production in some places where conditions make this possible by the application of unusual labor. The price of the commodity now increases by the action of the law of supply and demand, just as much as the labor necessary to get the results required.

There also occurs from time to time a reduction of the demand for a commodity below the supply without change in the labor of its production. Other things have been found to better fulfill its purpose perhaps; or its purpose has ceased to be. A part of the labor of production has been useless labor, wasted labor, creating no value therefore, though necessary to produce so much more of the product than can be used. As before, the value of the aggregate product will be the amount of average useful human labor necessarily consumed in it, something less than the labor actually consumed.

It seems that there is a simple law of dependence of the value of a commodity upon the average useful labor alone consumed in its production, and that such constant dependence upon anything else alone cannot be shown to be. It is suggested that value is a dependent, variable function of several independent variables; the law of its dependence is not yet suggested, much less demonstrated. Special causes may present peculiar problems. A great many forces in a community may interfere to create unusual complexities, as the passing wind or a falling body disturbs the surface of the lake to its utmost limits. But it will be found at last that according to the general law, after force or fraud, or even a prolonged monopoly have spent themselves, the prices of commodities seek the level of the labor of their production as surely and persistently as water runs down hill. Value is abstract and distinct entirely from those concrete things useful to human wants in which it is embodied, and which constitute wealth.

The manipulation of value for the getting of more value without useful labor on the part of those who profit is common. In-

deed the consumption of human life in unpaid labor to create profits, interest, and rent is the basis of our business system. Those who successfully manage the accepted and legal processes by which this eminently respectable purpose is accomplished are the men whom we all delight to honor. They are not to be held responsible for a business system they did not design, and which they cannot change; but their willingness to profit by it and defend it is seen. To the value so manipulated only the term capital properly applies. Capital is value manipulated in one form or another according as in one or the other it is expected most rapidly to be increased beyond the useful labor its owners add to it. "Value, therefore, now becomes value in process, money in process, and, as such, capital. It comes out of circulation, enters into it again, preserves and multiplies itself within its circuit, comes back out of it with expanded bulk, and begins the same round ever afresh. $M-M'$, money which begets money, such is the description of capital from the mouths of its first interpreters, the mercantilists (middle of p. 82 of *Capital*). Its common processes have attained the standing of orthodoxy.

The power to labor being commonly for sale, has become a commodity. As a commodity its value is determined like the value of all commodities by the average labor necessary to produce such quantity and quality of it. The value of labor power is the labor of its production, the labor of producing and sustaining in working order a human being, that is the labor of production of the things he consumes. The opportunities of employment are limited by the chances of profit and the owners of the means of employment. The chances of profit are limited by the possibility of selling the products of industry at a price greater than paid for their production, and consequently greater than the producers can pay for their own product. The sale of the product is therefore dependent upon an expanding market ever beyond the field of present capitalist production. But physical limits have very nearly been reached; and the nations which are now a foreign market for our goods very rapidly become themselves manufacturers competing fiercely for the smaller foreign market remaining. Competition among workers for the inadequate opportunities of employment reduces the wage of labor to the price of its subsistence. The labor power of the man applied to the means of production will create more wealth than sufficient to sustain his own life. If the labor power purchased at the price of his subsistence could not create a surplus above what the laborer must consume, no wealth could be accumulated. The estimate made by the capitalist class in the last United States Census shows that in 1900 by the labor of the wage workers a value twice as great as their wages was added to the raw materials of the products of American manu-

facturers, after paying all miscellaneous and other expenses besides. (P. 982 of Manufactures, Part II, 12th Census of the United States.) But in order to invest a portion of his capital in the labor power which is the source of his dividends, the capitalist must invest a larger and ever larger part of his capital in the means of production which are not the source of his dividends. The machinery that saves more labor is more complex and more expensive, and in it more capital is tied up. It works up more raw material, with which it must be supplied, and in this more capital is involved. The capital invested per employe in American manufactures in 1850 was \$557, in 1900 it was \$1,721 (see above reference). Each wage worker must produce the interest on three times as much capital as fifty years ago. The part of his working day consumed in unpaid labor for the creation of profits over and above his wages must be increased, and the part paid for in his wages must by all possible means be reduced. We should expect accordingly what all available evidence converges to a focus upon proving. We are triumphantly told that the average wage of the American employe has increased 77 per cent since 1844. It is of no consequence that the productivity of his labor has multiplied, according to these gentlemen, ten or twenty times, and that against the resistance of the greatest monopolies the prices of his products have been but slightly reduced. Eighty-four cents will buy now what one dollar was required to pay for of the necessities of life when methods of production were crude; so that the average wage will purchase now almost twice as much. But the wage of the working class can now buy a smaller part of their product than ever before.

Since the illogical and unrighteous distribution of wealth produced in the present industrial system is its most intolerable wrong, the determination of the pay of the worker and the distribution of commodities in whatever business system this one is immediately to develop can be a matter of no small concern, and will be its first problem. As a business proposition, socialism guarantees to every worker the full product of his toil. Our principal objection to the present system is that some are enriched by the unpaid labor of others. Many people are confirmed in the belief that socialism involves equal pay to all workers in a co-operative state. A great many do not distinguish between socialism and communism. The motto of communism is, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." That this should be the fundamental principle of a business system immediately to replace the present one is obviously impossible, whatever the development of the industrial order may be beyond industrial democracy. It must be equally impossible to maintain a business system in which every worker receives the same pay for whatever service. This would

antagonize the very purpose of the socialist movement. It has never been proposed and would be impossible to restrict the desire to do useful work for which unlimited opportunities are afforded by nature. It is moreover true that the labor of various persons is not equally productive, nor could it be made so except in special conditions and to an approximate degree. All cannot receive the same pay, therefore, unless some are rewarded by the unpaid labor of others.

Very few commodities are the product of the labor of one or a few workers. The making of a watch, for instance, involves eight hundred operations. Whose, therefore, shall the product be? While it is plainly impossible to divide the product into the shares that belong to each worker, it is equally plain that the part of the work done by each can be estimated as to its time, its intensity, and its skill. And every worker shall be paid accordingly if each receives the full product of his labor; that is, if industrial democracy secures to every useful worker a share of the whole product of labor, the same as his share of labor. It is not his own product that the worker desires, but the products of other workers in place of his own. The fact that some particular workman in taking a day to make a certain thing consumes three times as much as the usual time, does not entitle him to the product of a day's labor three times as productive as his own, though he is entitled to his own product after the raw material is paid for. Nor would the fact that the skill of another man enables him to get in one hour the results of three hours average labor rightly deprive him of three times as much for his labor.

Here we are at once involved unavoidably in the exchange of commodities, and must consider the law governing, the law of gravitation of commodities. This law rules the middle or the dark ages of finance now passing "as an over-riding law of nature," notwithstanding the ignorance and defiance of its industrial lords. How accurately and how absolutely is shown in "Capital, A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production," by Carl Marx. The desire of men to get the greatest results possible for the effort expended is natural, and legitimate and enduring. The resulting economic law is equally enduring and strong enough to govern the past and present industrial systems not only without their recognition, but against the utmost resistance of their greatest financial institutions and the governments. If we are considering what may be the industrial system which may be expected to develop out of the existing industrial feudalism, rather than in speculations on the distant future, it must be concluded that economic law will rule as surely the immediate future as the immeasurable past. So are the prices of goods adjusted to accord at least approximately with the labor of their production. If the reward for ef-

fort in a certain kind of employment were better than for the same effort in other lines, labor would be attracted to that employment. The fact that an excessive number sought work therein would be the best possible evidence that the advantages of such employment are excessive. Vice versa, there could be no better proof that the conditions and remuneration of a certain class of work were relatively poor, and that injustice was being done than that the number seeking employment therein was insufficient to meet the requirements of the work. There must be readjustment accordingly. Mistaken attempts to fix arbitrarily prices and the wages of various kinds of labor would be overwhelmed, even if these mistakes were enforced by the greatest of all monopolies, the machinery of the state, organized society. That the equalizing of the attractiveness of the various employments and the approximate equalizing of pay would gradually result in industrial democracy "in order to attract or retain a supply of labor equal to the demand in any stated employment," is a happy condition that must grow out of equality of opportunity to all.

New York, July 26, 1903.

WARREN ATKINSON.

Ascending Stages of Socialism

The central idea running through that conception of the universe which the discoveries and generalizations of modern science have imposed upon the cultivated thought of the present day is that of evolution. We now know that nothing in the universe is fixed or stationary. All things are in a state of flux and constant change, and have arrived at their present state by a long-continued process of development. The solid earth under our feet was once a gaseous mist, and at this very moment is rushing restlessly and with unthinkable velocity toward the uncharted wastes of boundless space. The so-called "eternal hills" have many a time reared their towering summits to the skies only to be washed down again and again into the abysmal depths of the sea. The teeming and varied life upon the globe has risen from humble beginnings, and passed through many mutations of form and fortune, ere reaching, after the strain and strife of the ages, its present perfection and beauty of adaptation; and proud man himself must see in the *Pithecanthropus Erectus*, or extinct Ape-Man of Malaysia, the link of kinship that binds him to the rest of the animal kingdom.

Now the development of the human race from animality, and through savagery to civilization, has only been possible with the slow and concurrent development of its physical, intellectual and social powers, or faculties, and these powers or faculties must continue to grow and expand as man rises to a higher scale of life and a higher civilization. At every stage of human culture there must be an adaptation between the powers of the individual and the requirements of the social environment, and it is impossible to hurry on the development of social forms and institutions ahead of the development that is taking place in the powers of the individuals composing society. The goal of evolution is in that form of economic life in which there shall be a complete harmony of interests between the individual and society, and between each individual and every other individual; a harmony of interests which shall permit and make possible the full and unrestricted gratification of every man's desires without such gratification diminishing the opportunities for the gratification of any other man's desires, and in which none shall have desires which it shall not be possible out of the social abundance to thus fully and completely gratify; but the organic and industrial changes which are required to enable men to attain this most perfect state are too profound for us to rightly imagine that it can be brought about as rapidly as

paper constitutions can be amended, or as ideological conceptions can be nominally accepted as the political faiths of majorities.

The nature of man as he exists today in the regions subject to the conditions of modern civilization, is the result of the compromise between the egotistic passions inherited from and indispensable in that long period of the earlier evolution of life during which the maintainance of the species and the progress of being could only be achieved by universal conflict and unmitigated individualism, and the altruistic feelings generated in that later form of evolution under which fitness of life comes to mean fitness for social life, and under which conflict tends to give way to concord, competition to co-operation, and individualism to Socialism. While the individual is thus, at the present time, at about the middle point in the development of his moral nature between the conditions appropriate to the isolated and warring life of the past, and the conditions essential to the highest form of social and co-operative life, the changes that in the course of a century have revolutionized industry have suddenly brought us face to face with problems the solving of which requires an equal revolution in government and society and an equal revolution in the mutual relations of the individuals composing society.

The economic development has now reached the point where the old individualistic struggle for existence by the process of competitive production and the private ownership by the user of the means of production has become impossible. Competition is no longer the state of stable equilibrium in the economic life of society. The scale of production has grown and grown until it has become national and international in its magnitude, excluding ever more the possibility of a real rivalry of establishments, and the function of ownership of the now vastly enlarged and costlier machinery of production has become divorced, and necessarily so, from the labor of operating it, while being concentrated under the monopolistic control of a small non-producing class. The just and the unjust, the wise and the foolish, the industrious and the lazy, have thus alike fallen a prey to the exploitation of the few who now own all the means of life and labor, and upon whom society is dependent for the maintenance of its existence.

Clearly, such a state of affairs, so detrimental to the interests of an increasing majority, so destructive of the conditions of social welfare, cannot continue forever. The producers of the world will not indefinitely continue to permit the major portion of the fruits of their labor to be appropriated by a parasitic class owning the earth by divine right.

But a return to primitive individualistic production is now impossible. By an irrevocable edict of progress, production has now become a social function and must remain so. It is only the

private control of production as a source of unearned profit and the private appropriation by the non-producers of the profits of the social labor that must be eliminated; and this means the substitution of social control and social ownership for private control and private ownership. It means that Socialism is the only alternative to plutocratic individualism.

Here let us stop for a moment to see just what is meant by the word Socialism.

Socialism is a generic term. There are many kinds of Socialists and many conceptions of what Socialism properly is. Much confusion is hence caused since the advocates of any particular form of Socialism usually represent it and often succeed in having outsiders accept it as the real and only true Socialism. Neglecting, however, the narrow construction which fanatics, whether calling themselves Socialists or Individualists, would put upon the word, we will here define Socialism as being any order of society or doctrine favoring any order of society, under which the prevailing mode of production is by public agency.

Now when we study the works of the different writers, from Plato and Sir Thomas More to Bakounine and William Morris, who classed themselves or who would by the above definition be correctly classed as Socialists, we find that the essential difference in the teachings of these various writers consists in the different degrees of confidence which they placed in the individual, and the amount of external control over the actions of the individual which they believed to be necessary for the maintenance of order and the continuance of their system.

We find that, in general, the earlier writers favored rigid supervision and restraint, both in the field of production and of consumption, over the economic activities of the individual, and as a corollary thereto they also favored the existence of a separate supervising and regulating class not responsible to the masses of the people and whose members were to be recruited either by birth within the ranks of the regulating class, or by merit, or else by seniority; this autocratic system having been, indeed, actually realized in the Empire of Peru; on the other hand, the modern school tends to the opposite view as to individual liberty, particularly in the domain of consumption, and to the most unqualified democracy in government and administration.

Of course, it is out of the question to suppose that modern Socialists, simply out of respect for the opinion of theorists of another age, would consent to relinquish any part of the political progress that has already been achieved by the race under capitalism. We need not, therefore, here further discuss those social proposals of writers of past generations which the advancing thought and changed conditions of the world have left so far

behind. There is no danger of modern Socialism going deliberately backward in the path of political progress upon acquiring possession of the powers of government. The indications point rather to the danger of its going too rashly forward, with the use of the perfected political machinery, towards attempting to realize an economic idealism in the distribution of the product of the social labor for which humanity is as yet far from being ripe. It is in the formulæ of distribution or consumption of the various schools of modern Socialism that there is to be found food for thoughtful consideration at the present day.

If we keep clearly in mind the great truth of evolutionary philosophy, that the present organic and moral development of the race represents but a passing phase of its history, we must see that it is impossible to formulate a scheme of wealth distribution which shall be exactly suitable to mankind in its present state of organic and organically moral progress and which shall at the same time be equally applicable to any and all future stages of advancement. The normal form of distribution prevailing in any society must correspond to the particular stage of progress towards social perfection attained by its units. Any attempt to institute a higher and more idealistic form of distribution in a society than is warranted by the state of moral and organic development of its members must result in retrogression instead of progress; for where the individuals in a community would not voluntarily, and as part of their ordinary private conduct, regularly and habitually practice such self-restraint in the satisfaction of their various desires, both egoistic and philoprogenitive, as would maintain the equilibrium between the collective resources and the demands upon them, it would be necessary for the community, in its coercive capacity, to decide, by means of enactments having the force of law, what each individual's consumption should be. Thus the formula: "To each according to his needs," if that, for example, should be the principle of distribution adopted, would come to mean: "To each according to his needs as determined by others," and would involve the most odious and far-reaching tyranny in its practical application.

But Socialism, as we have seen by our definition, is not committed to any particular scheme of distribution. Socialism has to do, properly, only with the general mode of production. Each generation of the people of the future will have to settle by itself this question of distribution, whether it settle it right or wrong.

However, even though we are living in an age when the cause of Socialism has yet to be won, and indeed, for that very reason, it is incumbent upon us and in no way presumptuous, to endeavor by the method of scientific reasoning and with the light cast upon the subject by the philosophy of evolution, to solve, at least

to our own satisfaction, this problem of distribution under Socialism and to trace the changes in the form of distribution that must follow the rise of man as an individual to that higher organic life vouchsafed by the teachings of modern science.

We have seen that the fundamental difference between the various schools of Socialists consists in the degree of confidence they put in the individual and in the resulting more or less liberal measures they advocate as to the mode of distribution between the citizens of the Socialist Republic of the product of the common labor. We have also seen that according to the teachings of evolutionary philosophy, human nature is not unalterable, but is on the contrary undergoing a process of constant change, moving ever onward to a higher and higher stage of intellectual and moral development and tending ever to approach the state of perfect adaptation to the conditions of existence that must prevail under the most advanced and ideal social order. If this be so, then a mode of distribution and of the regulation of the social labor which would be wholly inapplicable for men as now constituted and as they will doubtless be constituted for a long time to come, might be perfectly appropriate for men of a more advanced type and at some future period of the world's development. The proposals of the idealists must, therefore, be condemned, not as being absolutely wrong, but as being wrong relatively to the time and the period of history in which they are now advocated. Viewed in this light, it becomes important to examine, even at some detail, these various proposals concerning the mode of distribution under Socialism, since the proposals foreshadow actual future stages of the economic development.

First, then, let us turn our attention to that most popular and least Utopian of these idealistic proposals; the proposal, namely, which would require that every individual in an industrial democracy shall receive an equal income from the community and shall in return be expected or compelled to give the utmost that he is capable of giving in effort for the common weal, at least within the regular hours of labor.

There can be no doubt that such a system of social economy, if we exclude the compulsory feature in the regulation of the individual's labor which it necessarily involves, represents a higher and more generous social idea than where the formula of distribution would be: To each according to his deeds. It must also be conceded that the spirit of solidarity and brotherhood which such a system must promote, must itself be conducive, to that extent, to more intense and more effective economic effort. Notwithstanding all this, however, the objections against this system of distribution of incomes are, as we shall see, too grave to permit

us to accept it as the form of distribution adapted for men as now constituted.

The rise of man in the scale of being as a member of organic creation may under one of its aspects be regarded as consisting of a growth or progressive increase in the amount of vital energy available to each individual, and the amount of energy available to each individual is dependent upon the biological law of use and disuse. It is by the exercise or *use* of any faculty that its power increases and it is by the putting forth of due effort or energy in the exercise of the various faculties that the total sum of energy or power of effort increases. But the amount of effort that must be put forth in the exercise of the faculties in order to increase their power, the amount of labor, physical or mental, that must be performed, in order as with sufficient nutrition, to permanently increase the sum of physiological and psychological energy at the disposal of the individual, is such as requires a painful and long continued overcoming of natural inertia. This overcoming of natural inertia is, however, indispensable to the organic progress of the race and the maintenance of a high and ever advancing civilization. As there is a difference in the amount of energy that can with the same relative effort be put forth by different individuals, and as there is a consequent difference in the relative value of their labor, physical or mental, the stimulus of reward in the product, or in the value of the product, is essential to induce the maximum social product, the maximum social efficiency, and the maximum social and individual progress.

The formula of distribution for the existing type of humanity, therefore, must be: To each according to his deeds. To be carried away by sentimental considerations and institute the system of equality of remuneration immediately or even within a few generations after the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth, would be fatal to the highest interests of human advancement and so diminish the total product of labor and the amount to be divided among each that all would lose. The more capable and productive individuals would not, on the average, exert themselves to the utmost of their power, when the fruits of their efforts would be shared in alike by the slothful and incompetent, and the latter, on their part, would also fail to labor as diligently as they might otherwise do, if all could partake equally and irrespective of one's personal merit or industry in the output of the wealth of a continent. In proportion to the diminution of the per capita income would the dissatisfaction with the system increase and the increasing dissatisfaction with the system would still further reduce the total social product and the total per capita income. Finally, if despite the manifest disadvantages of the system to the great majority of the population, the latter still

continued to give it their political support, as capitalism is now, for example, supported by its victims, the per capita income would become too small to provide the adequate physical and mental energy to the individual to enable him to labor so as to maintain production even at the point required to supply the bare necessities of life, and there would be at last result a breakdown that would compel the abandonment of the system.

From another point of view we may also see that the arbitrary equalization of incomes of the individuals in a society, and irrespective as it necessarily must be of their individual merit, is contrary to the intentions of nature and must in the end become impracticable.

That fecundity of life which covers the earth from Pole to Pole and from the highest mountain summits to the uttermost depths of sea with animal and vegetable organisms, in the human race likewise stimulates multiplication to the point where over any given area and at any given point in the development of the arts of production and of the institutions governing the distribution of wealth, population could not further increase without reducing the standard of living prevailing at the time by unduly raising the ratio of population to the natural resources and to the available supply of the means of subsistence.

Now where the incomes of the masses of the people depend upon each man's personal efforts or are directly proportionate to the value of their labor, taken individually, then where under the particular conditions as regards the productivity of labor, the natural resources of the country, the ratio in which the producers as a class share in the wealth they produce, etc., population reaches the point where any further increase would involve a fall in the average income and in the average standard of living of the masses of the people; there come into play certain forces and motives which act upon the individual so as to wholly or partly restrain such further increase. Each individual being obliged out of his own earnings, which are proportionate to his exertions, to provide for his own needs and for the needs of his family, if he have any, there results a tendency to restrain the average size of families and to raise the average age of marriage, and the fall in the birth rate which thereby ensues tends to maintain population at an equilibrium with the natural resources and with the desired standard of living.

Far different, however, must it be, where each individual is guaranteed an equal income with every other individual and irrespective of his own condition in labor and effort towards the production of wealth, and where, as a corollary thereto, each individual is also absolved from the task of providing at his own expense for the support of his offspring, however numerous these

may be, but has the cost of their maintenance and education paid for by the community. Lacking, as he must then, the motive which alone can restrain him from such satisfaction of his sexual and philoprogenitive instincts, as must in the natural course of things involve a rapid and progressive increase of population so long as the physical conditions permit; the income of each individual and the standard of living must, after a certain degree of populousness has been reached, begin to decline and to fall ever lower and lower until it has reached a bare existence level, and then, the motive for the restraint and overcoming of these instincts being still absent, the continuing births must bring about a state of overpopulation in which the scarcity and inadequacies of the necessities of life must result in so increasing the death rate as to bring it to an equality with the birth rate, and thereby, at last, establish an equilibrium, but an equilibrium based upon universal poverty, starvation, and misery.

It is often assumed, indeed, by Socialists of the "more advanced" or Utopian school, that by the biological law of animal fertility, according to which, the higher the scale of life the lower is the power of reproduction, we are justified in asserting that under the intellectually and spiritually stimulating environment of the Co-operative Commonwealth, the greater cultivation and development of men's higher faculties will so diminish the power of the lower instincts as to reduce the birthrate to a point where, while it will ensure the perpetuation of the race, it will no longer have a tendency even under a regime of economic irresponsibility in the relation of parents to offspring to cause overpopulation. This assumption is, however, as we must see, unwarranted. The fertility of a race is a function of its physical organism, and the physical organism and the innate power of the physical organism of any race or species can be perceptibly modified only in the long course of centuries or even of geologic epochs.

We are thus obliged to admit, that for many generations after the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment in its place of the system of collective ownership of the means of production and collective administration of industry, it will be necessary to leave untouched those basic principles regulating the relation between the individual and his product and between the individual and his progeny in accordance with which evolution has hitherto proceeded. To fit men for a higher life in the illimitable future which we know is ahead of us, the race must continue for an indefinite time to come under the dominion of that law of progress according to which each individual must be responsible in his own person for the results of his own actions, and according to which as parent he must be responsible for the maintenance and education of his offspring.

That social polity, then, which while it would secure to every individual equality of opportunity to the use of the means of production, would also ensure to each individual producer neither more nor less than the full value of his individual product, and which out of that product would oblige every individual to provide not only for all his own needs but also for all the just needs of his natural dependents, represents the first stage of Socialism through which the race must pass in its ascending journey toward the Perfect Commonwealth.

When, however, in the course of the further evolution of the race, man will at last have risen to the duties and responsibilities of the co-operative life; when, after the discipline of the ages, the individual will have been molded to the requirements of the future society; and when the old egoism, the old indolence, the old intellectual apathy and vacuity, the old savage passions and brutish appetites, will have disappeared and made way for new aims and desires, for new habits and feelings; when, in short, a new race will have arisen fitted for equality, equality will come.

The second stage of Socialism, however, the stage of equality, equality, that is, in the sense of equality of incomes, as depicted, for example, in Bellamy's works, is apparently not destined to be of very long duration. The superior attractiveness and superior economic advantages under conditions of high productivity of labor and high organic and moral development of the individual of that still more advanced state of society in which there will be neither money nor price, neither buying nor selling, will cause the Communistic principle of social economy to be adopted within a comparatively short period after the abandonment of the system of payment by results or payment according to the value of one's labor. There are practically no arguments against Communism which may not be urged with almost equal force against the system of equality of remuneration, and when the race will have become fitted by reason of its moral and physical adaptation to the conditions of a higher civilization and by reason of the progress in production to successfully apply the latter principle in its economic relations, it will not be long before it will be ready to enter into the next highest stage of social development which we are bound to recognize must be Communism.

Communism represents a higher civilization than mere Collectivism does. Communism represents a higher faith in the individual. Under Communism it would not be necessary to be perpetually carrying about documentary evidence, whether in the form of money or other credit tokens, of the right to partake of the means of existence. The purely economic advantages of this system, and considering merely the saving it would effect in the vast amount of labor now required in the collecting, receiving,

exchanging, etc., of money and other representatives of value are considerable. In some industries or forms of service from one-third to one-half or more of the cost of operation represents the labor of collecting the charges from the consumers or patrons; as, for example, in the case of street car transportation, privately operated bridges, turnpikes, etc. Even now we are compelled to acknowledge the utter wastefulness and impracticability, in many cases, of the direct payment system, by leaving our streets, public parks, and various other public utilities, free to all who would use them; and as time goes by the tendency to convert purchasable values into free and inalienable utilities will become more and more marked.

As fast as the private man will prove himself worthy of public trust; as fast as the public interest will be increasingly recognized as the individual's highest private interest; as fast as the instincts will become enlisted in the service of altruism, will it become safe to devote the wealth and the resources of the whole of society to the free satisfaction of the needs and desires of each individual. There will be no necessity for restraining consumption by limitations of purchasing power when there will be abundance for all, and there will be no incentive to extravagance in consumption when there will be no honor in ostentatious display.

But freedom merely in consumption does not represent the final and highest stage of social and economic evolution. Evolution cannot be said to have reached its limit until the adaptation of the individual to the social environment has become so complete that pleasure is found in the due performance of all the activities necessary for the maintenance of society. To this happy outcome of the evolutionary process we may, however, with full faith look forward. But when men will have come to perform all the needful labor of the world for the pleasure of the work; when the productivity of their labor, multiplied by now undreamt of inventions and unsuspected natural forces, will have become so great as to provide for their utmost needs; and when their moral development will have come to preclude the possibility of disputes as well about the distribution of the product as about the distribution of the work, there will be no longer need of external regulation: there will be no longer need of the rule of man by man; there will be no longer need of the State.

Anarchist-Communism is thus the best and highest stage of political and economic progress. But how unscientific it is to advocate in the present period of the world's development a theory of society which only after a transformation amounting to a revolution in the very nature of the race, a transformation that would under the most favorable conditions require thousands of

years for its consummation could scarcely then begin to be practicable.

The true radical is not he who would force the world into experiments which like that of the young frog that as related in the fable desired to expand to the size of an ox, could end only in disaster; but rather it is the man who, recognizing the limitations of our nature and recognizing also the possibilities of its development, would help to so order things that an environment would be created that would tend to the greatest happiness of the greatest number in the present while hastening the world's progress towards the more perfect society of the future.

RAPHAEL BUCK.

Economic Aspects of Chattel Slavery

(Continued.)

The greater cheapness of the wage slave made itself most apparent in the border states and consequently these states began to show a steady decline in the number of chattel slaves. As a result of this there arose a sharp division between two classes of slave states. Virginia, Maryland and North Carolina became known as the slave breeding states, while Georgia, Mississippi and Louisiana were the slave using states. This was accompanied by a shifting of the cotton industry to the southwest, or rather the shifting of this industry was a primary cause of the change in the center of the system of chattel slavery. Another reason for the rapid increase of slaves in Louisiana was the growth of the cane sugar industry. The following table showing the increase in the fifteen years preceding 1850 gives an idea of this movement. It is taken from James F. W. Johnson's "Notes on North America," published in 1851, Vol. 2, p. 363:

	With Horsepower.	Steam Power.	Total.	Slaves.
1844	671	480	762	63,000
1849	671	865	1,536	126,000

This same author points out the results of this system in a most vivid manner (pp. 354 and 355). "One of the most melancholy results of the system of slavery in Virginia, especially since slavery ceased to be profitable within the state itself, is the attention which proprietors have been induced to pay to the breeding and rearing of slaves and to the regular sale of the human produce to the southern states, as a means of adding to their ordinary farming profits—as a branch in fact of common rural industry. One of the representatives to congress from Virginia in a pamphlet on the slavery question recently published says: 'Virginia has a slave population of nearly half a million, whose value is chiefly dependent on southern demand.'"

The author then makes calculations to show that it is much more profitable to raise slaves for sale than for use. "The number of slaves in Virginia is diminishing. In 1830 it was 470,000, while in 1840 it was only 450,000, and it is probably less now. The number sold, therefore, exceeds in a small degree (by 2,000 a year) the natural increase. Now the annual increase of the whole slave population is about 3 per cent, which upon 450,000 is 13,500. And if only 1,500 slaves a year be sold beyond this

natural increase, about 15,000 will every year go south to the slave markets from the state of Virginia. As these will generally be sold in the prime of life, they may be reckoned worth at least \$300 a head, which for the 15,000 gives \$4,500,000 as the price received for human stock exported every year from Virginia.

But Virginia produces yearly 50,000,000 pounds of tobacco, and 2,500,000 pounds of cotton, the value of which, at an average, of 8½ cents a pound, is \$4,375,000. That is to say, the slave rearing husbandry brings in more money yearly to Virginia than all its tobacco and cotton do. It is surprising, then, that the Virginians, both individually and as a state, should be anxious to enlarge and keep up the southern demand.”*

As the struggle between the two systems of exploitation grew sharper there arose a great amount of literature to show the economic superiority of wage slavery. One book which treated this subject most exhaustively was Hinton Rowan Helper's "The Impending Crisis." This book was written by a resident of the western portion of North Carolina, and right here it is worth while to note the fact that in the mountain regions of West Virginia and North Carolina and northern Georgia and Alabama there was a system of small farming and minor manufactures very similar to that existing throughout the northern states. As we might almost know without examination, this was a strong anti-slavery locality. It was from this region that Helper came. His book consists of a marvelous wealth of facts intended to show the economic disadvantage of chattel slavery. He shows how utterly deficient the south was in comparison with the north in manufactures, enterprise, education and material wealth of all sorts. He points out how the commerce of the south declined as that of the north grew; how the great cities of the south stood still while those of the north advanced by leaps and bounds; how immigration came into the north while it shunned the south; how land on southern plantations was impoverished and taxable property continually grew less and less in value while the reverse was true in the north.

This book had a most remarkable circulation in the years immediately preceding the war, and probably if the truth as to the real factors which made public opinion could be determined, it had far more to do with bringing on the Civil War than did "Uncle Tom's Cabin." At one time a committee of northern capitalists raised sufficient funds to circulate 100,000 copies of a

*McHenry, "The Cotton Trade," pages 212-13, denies that Virginia was a "slave-breeding" state and instances a law passed in 1812 by the Virginia legislature forbidding the exportation of slaves. See also Wilson, "Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America," Vol. I, pages 100-101, and especially Wm. Henry Smith's "Poetical History of Slavery," Vol. I, pages 2-5, where the whole subject is treated.

synopsis of it. When it is remembered that it is a book of over 400 pages some idea is gained of how important it was considered by the ruling classes of the North at that time. Copies of it are still generally to be found in most second hand stores, and I would urge every Socialist to buy a copy and read it, as it will prove an eye-opener to most people, especially if they have gained their ideas of American history from popular text books.

He addresses his book to the poor whites of the south and this calls attention to a class which is ordinarily overlooked. He makes the following classification of slave holders in 1850 which is of so great interest of showing how few men there were who really owned more than five slaves, at a time when one would naturally think from a reading of Southern literature that every white person in the South was a plantation owner.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE SLAVE HOLDERS—1850.

Holders of	1 slave	68,820
Holders of	1 and under	5	105,683
Holders of	5 and under	10	80,765
Holders of	10 and under	20	54,595
Holders of	20 and under	50	29,733
Holders of	50 and under	100	6,196
Holders of	100 and under	200	1,479
Holders of	200 and under	300	187
Holders of	300 and under	500	56
Holders of	500 and under	1,000	9
Holders of	1,000 and over	2

Aggregate number of slave holders in the United States347,525

He points out that even this table is inaccurate in that it includes slave hirers and some duplications and he computes that the actual number of slave holders in 1850 amounted to 475,525. Ingle, in his "Southern Sidelights," p. 263, states that this number remained practically constant until 1860. As there was a total white population in the slave states of 6,184,477 in 1850, it at once becomes apparent that the slaveholding class, like all ruling classes, was really but a small proportion of the whole.

George Weston wrote a book in 1856 which he calls "The Poor Whites of the South," in which he claims that their whole degraded position was due to slavery. His remarks as to the unimportant place which they played in determining public opinion, etc., are extremely interesting:

"The non-slaveholding whites of the South, being not less than seven-tenths of the whole number of whites, would seem to be entitled to some inquiry into their actual condition, and

especially as they have no real political weight or consideration in the country and little opportunity to speak for themselves. I have been for twenty years a reader of Southern newspapers and a hearer of congressional debates, but in all that time I do not recollect ever to have seen or heard these non-slaveholding whites referred to by Southern gentlemen as constituting any part of what they call 'the South.'"

This appeal to the poor whites of the South by the Northern anti-slavery politicians was not so disinterested and ingenuous as it appeared on the surface. William H. Smith, in his "Political History of Slavery" (Vol. I, p. 76), says concerning a pamphlet issued by Salmon P. Chase and nominally appealing to the non-slaveholding Southern whites: "The chief purpose Mr. Chase had in view in addressing the non-slaveholders was to influence the political action of the intelligent working classes of the North, by bringing into sharp contrast the two systems of social order."

Here indeed was a delicate point for the Northern capitalist. The problem which confronted him was how to rouse the Northern wage worker to the fighting point against the South and chattel slavery without at the same time opening his eyes to the fact of wage slavery. It was necessary to find an "issue" which did not involve this dangerous point and yet on which the North and South would be divided. This was finally found in the cry of "Save the Union." Few people would learn from the text-books on American history used in our schools that the abolitionists were the most rabid disunionists, or that New England states had ever threatened to secede. The "Hartford Convention" of the war of 1812 is an example of the second point, while countless quotations from the abolition sources can be found to prove the first. Wendell Phillips was particularly violent in his advocacy of a dissolution of the Union. In 1856 he delivered a speech entitled "The Constitution a Pro-Slavery Compact," in the introduction to which he said: "To continue this disastrous alliance longer is madness. The trial of fifty years only proves that it is impossible for free and slave states to unite on any terms, without all becoming partners in the guilt, and responsible for the sin of slavery. We dare not prolong the experiment, and with double earnestness we repeat our demand upon every honest man to join us in the outcry of the American Anti-Slavery Society—"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."*

Even in January, 1860, after South Carolina had already seceded, Phillips delivered a speech in Music Hall, Boston, with a mob howling at the doors, in the course of which he said: "'The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice.' The 'Covenant of death' is annulled; the 'agreement with hell' is broken to pieces. The chain

*Capitals in original report circulated by the society.

which has held the slave system since 1787 is parted. Thirty years ago Northern abolitionists announced their purpose to seek the dissolution of the American Union. Who dreamed that success would come so soon?"

Two years later, however, he had changed his position and in a letter to the *New York Tribune* of August 16, 1862, he states that "From 1843 to 1861 I was a disunionist. * * * Sumpter changed the whole question. After that peace and justice both forbade disunion."

The reason for the fanaticism of the North on the question of the Union is at once apparent to any one with a knowledge of modern capitalism. In the strife for world markets the government would be a prominent factor and the capitalists desired that this government should be as strong, extensive and centralized as possible.

There was still another reason which was seen by some observers at that time and should at once occur to the Socialist student. Capitalism constantly demands new fields for exploitation in order to dispose of the surplus product which it takes from the laborers. For this purpose it has need of some territory with a lower economic organization than itself. This is the motive which impels the seeking of colonies. Kettel, in "Southern Wealth and Northern Profits," saw this point very clearly and thus states it (pp. 19 and 42): "We have seen that England, in the course of her colonial system, had, by furnishing goods and slaves, and enjoying the carrying trade of her dependencies, acquired a vast capital, while the colonies that produced that wealth had accumulated nothing; they had, in fact, become poorer. * * * The New England states from the first were mostly engaged in navigation and manufactures. It was there that capital first accumulated from application to those employments. Agriculture spread in two directions, viz., across the mountains to the west and southwest from the South Atlantic states. These two agricultural branches divided naturally into free and slave labor, and both sections held the same position to New England as all the colonies had before held to the mother country. The manufacturing and navigating states, as a matter of course, accumulated the wealth which the other sections produced."

Moreover, the capitalist class of the North had already learned how valuable the national government was to them in the enactment of tariff laws, the creation of internal improvements, the granting of land to railroads, etc. Edward A. Pollard, in "The Lost Cause," p. 52, thus describes the attitude of the North on this matter: "In the North there was never any lack of rhetorical fervor for the Union; its praises were sounded in every note of tumid literature, and it was familiarly entitled 'the glorious.' But

the North worshiped the Union in a very low commercial sense; it was a source of boundless profits; and it had been used for years as a means of sectional aggrandizement."

There is one phase of the evolution of the last two decades preceding the Civil War to which I have never seen any reference in any books reviewing this period with a single exception, to which reference will be made later. Yet it is one which could not have helped but add to the antagonism between the ruling classes. There was quite a tendency on the part of the Southern slave owners to enter the field of manufacturing. At the time this movement was attracting considerable attention. Among the numerous books which were written to reply to Helper's "Impending Crisis" was one by Thomas P. Kettell, which he entitled "Southern Wealth and Northern Profits," the meaning of this title being, of course, that the South was the real wealth-creating section of the country, while the North simply traded upon and exploited this wealth. He instances many figures (p. 53 *et seq.*) to show that manufacturing was increasing in a much more rapid rate in the south than in the north during the period from 1840 to 1850. From the census of 1860 we discover that this movement did not continue with quite the same rapidity that he expected, although there was a steady growth in the manufacture of cotton goods, boots and shoes and a few other branches.

The increase in the value of the production of cotton goods from 1850 to 1860 being 43 per cent, the total value of the production for 1860 amounting to \$8,145,067. In regard to boots and shoes the census of 1860 says: "In the southern states there was an increase equivalent to 89.9 per cent, the aggregate value being \$3,973,313." Kettell states the hopes of the southern slave owner in this direction as follows:

"What we do find in these figures is, that the south having become possessed of capital, is prosecuting manufactures at a rate which will soon make a 'home market' for its raw materials and place it foremost in the ranks of exporters of goods. The figures show that it is fast supplanting northern imported goods within its own industry. It will not, like the north, however, have provincial markets to supply, but having all within its own border, will actually diminish its purchases from the north. It will have foreign markets for its surplus. The countries of South America and Asia will be open to it, and if it there encounters British and New England competitors it will have the advantage of having unprotected developed its manufactures in the face of the competition of New England goods in the home market, and therefore become able to meet these goods in any market. If in a few years it does not become a seller of cotton goods to the north on a large scale, as it already is on a small scale, since Georgia and Alabama

cottons are favorites in New York, it will take none of them. The north will, however, still require food and materials and the scale of dependence may vibrate."

In many of these plants the negro slaves were being used. This whole movement is quite thoroughly described in Ingle's "Southern Sidelights," pp. 75-93. Here we find such papers as the *Dry Goods Economist* began to speak "fearfully of southern competition in cotton weaving." An English observer, whom we have previously quoted, Mr. James F. W. Johnson, says on this point, p. 364: "There is another aspect of this question which awakens gloomy apprehensions as to the future of the American slave. The introduction of the cotton manufacture into the slave states—Virginia, Kentucky, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee and Mississippi—in which there are some hundreds of factories, consuming already from 300,000 to 400,000 bales of cotton a year, has brought a new use of his slaves within the reach of the southern planters. The same power which compels them to toil in gangs under a burning sun will constrain them to waste life in the factories, if it can be done profitably to the master. The great difficulty of the manufacturers in the New England states is the question of labor—the scarcity of work-people, the high wages they demand, and the delicacy required to manage them. In the south these difficulties vanish. Slave labor is easily obtained and the slave obeys as mechanically as the machine he superintends. A great and rapid extension of the factory system is therefore looked for in the south and many predict that the manufacturers of the eastern states will sink before them."

Just how far this movement would have progressed under slavery is now of course impossible to tell. It is noteworthy, however, that in the years just prior to the Civil War a large number of "conventions" were held throughout the south where the need of offering encouragement to manufactures was the principal subject of discussion.

A phase of the subject upon which emphasis was not laid at the time, but which undoubtedly had its weight, is set forth in a decidedly remarkable preface to a translation of De Cassagnac's "History of the Working and Burgher Classes." This preface is written by Benjamin E. Green and is dated 1871. He declares that the entire object of the Civil War was to "divorce southern capital from labor." He claims that the northern capitalists realized the coming of a struggle between them and their wage workers and were determined that the southern capitalists should not enjoy the privilege of an undisturbed industry. He claims that "The advocates of low wages learned that abolition would produce pauperism, that pauperism would increase competition in the struggle for bread; that increased competition would reduce

wages, with cheaper food and coarser clothing and fewer of the necessaries of life to the laborers. * * * The great party that elected Mr. Lincoln made war upon and subjugated the south and abolished slavery that free labor might be made cheaper than slave labor; which simply means a reduction of the wages of free labor below the cost of feeding and clothing the negro and taking care of him in sickness and infirmities of age."

He gathers together a host of quotations from the speeches of Northern men before the war which seemed to bear out this interpretation. He sums the whole matter up in the following most striking statement:

"The real conflict was, not between free and slave labor, but it was between the capital that hired free labor and the capital that owned slave labor. The interests of the former required a system of legislation that would put down wages and put up the cost of living. The interests of the latter require a diametrically opposite system. Wages went into, and the cost of living came out of, the pockets of the capital that owned slave labor. Wages came out of, and the cost of living went into, the pockets of the capital that hired free labor. Mr. Seward and Mr. Chase, were not long in discovering that herein consisted the philosophy of Mr. Jefferson's celebrated aphorism, 'The Democracy of the North are the natural allies of the Republicans of the South.' They were not slow to see that, while the interests and inclination of the capital that hired free labor called for a system of taxation imposing heavy burdens on the laboring classes, the interest and inclination of the capital that owned slave labor required a system of light taxes, high wages, fair prices for the products of labor, and cheap living."

This is, of course, the exact reverse of the idea which has been carefully inculcated in the schools and organs of "public opinion" in the North. Here we have always been taught to believe that "In essence it was from beginning to end a struggle by free labor at the North to free labor at the South."*

As the struggle went on the power of the North grew ever greater; railroads were flung through to the West to draw the allegiance of the Western farmer from Southern slave holder. The Abolitionists rung the changes on the word "free" to fire the enthusiasm of the laboring masses of the North. The efforts of the South to extend its territory involved the annexation of Texas, the Gadsden Purchase and the organization of filibustering expeditions against Cuba and Central America. The mighty flood of immigration which was pouring into the North

*A Political History of Slavery, by William Henry Smith. Introduction by Whitelaw Reid, p. XI.

was furnishing it with a body of voters who would soon deliver the government into the hands of their master, the capitalists.

This movement of extension I must pass over with far less attention than it deserves, as I hope to treat the whole subject of territorial extension in a later article. For the same reason I am compelled to omit all consideration of the part which the great frontier element played in this struggle, notwithstanding that these two points are perhaps as important as any belonging to the subject.

Indeed, it was the Frontier that finally turned the scale and Lincoln, who became the foremost figure in the whole conflict, was, as I have frequently said, a child of the Frontier.

Once that Lincoln was in power and the government in the hands of Northern capitalists there was absolutely no hope for the Southern slaveholder save in secession, and this notwithstanding the fact that the Republican party at that time was distinctly opposed to any abolition movement. But a ruling class which belongs to a social system already outgrown must, if it is to live, have complete and practically undisputed control of the machinery of government within which it exists. This was the case with the Southern slaveholders until the election of Lincoln.

Indeed this fact of the slaveholding domination of the central government was one of the principal causes of complaint by Northern writers and speakers. The presidency, speakership of the house, cabinet and federal offices had all been controlled by the slave power for the greater portion of the time since the formation of the government.*

During all this time the ruling class of the North was the clerical, capitalistic, trading and commercial class of New England. Owing to its peculiar character this ruling class lacked the flexibility and forms of Democracy which are the especial characteristics of a purely bourgeois ruling class. We see a somewhat similar phenomenon in the South at the present time. The old slave-holding aristocracy could never have produced a "Pitchfork" Tillman. It was only when competitive capitalism invaded the South that such as he appeared. In the same way it was really the highly competitive capitalism of the West that produced the party that was really capable of wresting supremacy from the chattel slave-owners. The Republican party arose from the frontier but was quickly accepted by the manufacturing capitalists of the East as expressing their position.

With the struggle of these two forces for supremacy, the Civil

*Helper's "The Impending Crisis," pp. 307-318 gives a complete table of the offices held by the North and the South since the establishment of the government. The facts in the text are taken from there.

War, Emancipation and reconstruction I must be content with short notice. It should now be evident to everyone that it is the rankest nonsense to talk about the Civil War being waged to abolish negro chattel slavery. Lincoln repeatedly declared such was not its object. Even after secession had begun and the War was almost upon the country, with Lincoln elected President, the leaders of the Republican party of the North offered to adopt a constitutional amendment forever securing the permanency of slavery in the South.*

When Fremont freed the slaves who came to his army during the early stages of the war, his action was promptly disavowed by the general government. Some of the generals even went so far as to return slaves to their masters and even to permit the latter to come within the Union lines and search for runaway slaves. Finally it was only as a war measure that emancipation was declared, and in no sense as an expression of any "moral sentiment" of the North.

The struggle from first to last was simply a contest between two classes of exploiters as to which should have the use of the general government for their purposes. That finally the North was only able to win by abolishing the particular method of exploitation in vogue in the South was largely an accident due to the fortunes of war.

I have had no time to treat save indirectly what is generally considered the most important phase of this whole subject—the contrasting forms of social organization which sprang from these two different forms of exploitation. This has already been done so many times that I think all my readers will know where to turn for anything they may wish to know in relation to it.

There is just one observation that I wish to make in reply to an alleged argument that is often offered in connection with the Civil War and its relation to the present effort of the wage-slaves to free themselves. It is said that it was not the negroes who freed themselves and therefore the Socialist position that "he who would be free, himself must strike the blow" is false. To this I would reply that the Civil War "freed" nobody, and least of all the negro. It was simply a squabble between exploiters for control of one of the instruments of exploitation—the general government. In the same way the illustrations and comparisons which are so often used by some Socialists in relation to the "freeing of the negroes" are essentially meaningless, since the grounds for comparison do not exist.

A. M. SIMONS.

*See Smith's "Political History of Slavery," Vol. I., pp. 331 to 343 *passim*.

EDITORIAL

The Ignorance of the Schools.

The surprising ignorance of Socialism which prevails in scholastic circles is an ever recurring evidence of the existence of class-divisions and the dominance of capitalist class interests. A visit to the class rooms of Sociology and Economics in almost any great university, would find much time given to the theories of society held by the Physiocrats and Mercantilists, and to theories of rent, interest, wages and profits long since forgotten outside purely scholastic circles. These long dead and gone and often admittedly false theories are studied from the dusty writings of their originators with greatest care against error and misunderstanding.

Now however crazy may be the philosophy of Socialism, it is older than many of these theories and has gained in importance ever since its first promulgation, and is now the working philosophy of a body of something over thirty million people, scattered throughout the civilized world, and with a tremendous influence on all fields of thought and action. Yet of this philosophy we find our universities most hopelessly and childishly ignorant. The majority of university curriculums fail to mention it at all. In a large and ever increasing minority some sort of teaching is ostensibly offered on the subject. In a great many cases (including some of our "best" universities) there is a course with some such title as "Social Reforms." The catalogue goes on to tell us that this course embraces a study of "Single Tax, Socialism, Eight-Hour Legislation, Organized Charity, and other schemes of social amelioration." If there be any among our readers who have received a college education at such an institution and have been thereby rendered incapable of realizing the ridiculousness of such a statement we would simply say that a corresponding ignorance applied to the biological department would include the theory of evolution in a course on "Hog Raising."

In perhaps a dozen of the really best institutions a course is offered treating exclusively of Socialism. Even then the text-book is all too frequently Professor Somebody-or-Other's "treatise," or "history" or

"impossibility" of Socialism. As a result the students come away worse than completely ignorant of Socialism, for ignorance at the worst implies an intellectual cavity to be filled, while their craniums are crammed with worthless rubbish.

In still fewer institutions the students are actually brought in contact with at least some of the writings of socialists. Even here, however, the students are kept from any knowledge of the real vital portions of the socialist philosophy. Not that any conscious attempt is made to deceive. It is simply a case of the "blind leading the blind" and both wallowing in the ditch of ignorance.

Such classes are generally assigned portions of "Capital," and this work, especially when attacked in this piece-meal manner with ignorant instructors, is absolutely unintelligible to the average college undergraduate. This may seem strange to those of our readers who can call to mind workingmen, absolute strangers to college walls, who have nevertheless mastered Marx's great work.

The workingman, however, sees in "Capital" but an accurate and carefully expressed analysis of his own life, experiences and closest interests. The average university student, even though he should occasionally be the son of a workingman, has had his mind so thoroughly impressed by the capitalist class-consciousness of the preparatory schools that he can gain access to the by no means simple propositions of Marx only across the broad chasm of divergent class psychologies.

All this would still be true even if Marx were fairly presented. But Marxism is a broad, comprehensive social philosophy, and not a series of formulas. Yet in all the university courses of Socialism concerning which we have been able to get any information, but two aspects of the Marxian philosophy have been presented, and these in a distorted form. Marx is presented as the formulator of a crude "labor value theory" and as the foreteller of a "co-operative commonwealth," and in both cases these are set forth in a utopian manner, as foreign as possible to the whole spirit of Marxian thought. Very little, if anything, is said about the materialistic interpretation of history, while the whole heart and soul of Socialism, the doctrine of social progress through class struggles is seldom even noticed.

And the strange thing in this connection is that these are just the phases of Socialist thought which are easiest to understand and which have been set forth in language that constitutes a model of clearness and logical form. In the scope of a small pamphlet, "The Communist Manifesto," written by the two greatest of Socialist writers, indorsed by hundreds of Socialist organizations, circulated during a half century by millions of copies in almost every known language, these fundamental principles of Socialism are set forth in words no one can well misunderstand. Surely even if such a pamphlet were filled with the veriest nonsense it would still merit attention because of its vast circulation and influence.

Yet a few years ago while we were lecturing before the Political Economy Club of the University of Chicago we held up a copy of this book before the over one hundred students present, nearly all of whom claimed to have studied Socialism more or less during their college course, and less than half a dozen had ever seen or heard of the work, and not one had read it. A less public but almost equally far-reaching inquiry at the University of Wisconsin exposed an equal ignorance, while conversation with Harvard students of a few years ago would indicate a similar condition there.

Another instance which shows how widespread ignorance of this work is in educated circles, was furnished by Mr. Ghent, the author of "A Benevolent Feudalism." He recently published a sort of roast of his reviewers in which he makes merry over what he evidently considers to be two contradictory statements appearing in the editorial notice of his book in this REVIEW, to the effect that while most of his ideas were taken from the Communist Manifesto, it was written largely from the small capitalist standpoint. A slight familiarity with the Manifesto would have shown him that his idea of capitalist class rule (which is all his "benevolent feudalism" really means) is there clearly set forth, without, to be sure, the fantastic terminology in which he has clothed it, and which, however clever it may be as a literary artifice, can scarcely be said to add to scientific accuracy of statement. At the same time he uses this idea in just the manner that would appeal to the little capitalist hoping to become an "industrial baron." Even more, if Mr. Ghent will read further he will find that the Communist Manifesto describes just that sort of literature and tells what part it really plays in social evolution. It is worthy of note as illustrating this same point that according to the aforesaid "roast" by Mr. Ghent none of the capitalist reviewers recognized the lack of originality in his book, while all the Socialist papers discovered this at once.

Still another example is furnished by the fact that not one of the hundreds of volumes written to refute, expose or explain away Socialism have ever clearly attacked the position set forth in the Manifesto. This notwithstanding the fact that these are the positions most clearly stated, easily understood, and most frequently repeated in all Socialist literature, while the labor value theory and the ideas of a future Socialist state are much less accessible to the casual reader.

We will venture to set forth in a series of postulates these fundamental principles, which are thus universally ignored, in the hope that if this comes across the vision of some scholastic observer he need no longer be compelled to plead ignorance on these points.

1. Social institutions are determined by the methods of producing and distributing economic goods.
2. Each economic system brings into the position of social rulership the possessors of the economic essentials of that system.
3. Improvements in the methods of production constantly make new

things essential economically and thus create a new class of social rulers who secure their domination only after a struggle with the previous ruling class. This is the method of social progress.

4. The present system has placed the owners of capital in possession of social control and they are using that control to advance their own interests.

5. Improvements in the method of production have now reached a stage where the capitalist class is less essential to social progress than the laboring class and hence the latter is struggling to displace the former with the certainty of victory.

6. The social system corresponding to laboring class domination of the economic system of today and of the probable future will have as its distinctive feature common ownership of the instruments for the production and distribution of wealth.

These are a series of simple assertions, easily understood and with no equivocation, yet we believe that ninety per cent of the literature of Socialism consists of elaborations and proofs of these. While many Socialists would disagree with the form in which they are stated and they have probably been much better stated elsewhere, especially in the Manifesto itself, yet few Socialists but would agree that they contain the essentials of the Socialist philosophy. Still one might search the hundreds and thousands of volumes that have been written by the opponents and critics of Socialism in vain to find any reference to them.

They are much more easily understood than the labor value theory or any fantastic theories of a future society. Why do not the scholastic critics of Socialism "expose their fallacy" if they are fallacious? If they do not do so are not Socialists justified in their belief that it is because those propositions are irrefutable?

It would be easy to go on and show from the writings of such men as Simon N. Patten, Lester F. Ward, Franklin Giddings and other of the foremost professorial exponents of economics and sociology, how they repeat as original, ideas long ago elaborated by Socialists, or how they ascribe to Socialists positions absolutely foreign to the whole Socialist philosophy.

Yet in closing we would wish to warn against the very justifiable contempt which most Socialists have for the writings of such men. It is true they are hopelessly ignorant of Socialism and no Socialist would take seriously anything they might say on that subject, yet they have often gathered quantities of material of greatest value to a knowledge of Socialism, and of much assistance in Socialist propaganda. At times also they have arrived at positions held by Socialists, or that help to support the Socialist position without themselves being aware of the fact.

Marx's Capital probably contains more references to non-Socialist economic literature than any work ever published, and the book could never have been written without a knowledge of that literature. Yet

poor and barren as most of the economic literature of the scholastic world of today is, it is much superior to that so carefully studied by Marx and it is a mistake on the part of Socialists to ignore it. Indeed it would be almost as easy to write on the ignorance of capitalist economics by Socialists as of the ignorance of Socialism by capitalist economists. Perhaps that may make the text of another editorial.

We publish elsewhere an article by Comrade Buck on "Ascending Stages of Socialism," to much of which we wish to express our dissent, notwithstanding its many excellent features. We do not believe that a particle of evidence has ever been produced to show that increase of population bears any direct ratio whatever to the economic well-being of the individual. It also seems to us that the utopian definition which is given of Socialism is so wholly out of agreement with the one which Socialists have come to accept that it is apt to merely mislead instead of explain. Neither do we think that it tends to clearness of thought to revive that other utopian idea which our opponents so often ascribe to us, that Socialism supposes the conscious "adoption" of any detailed "principle of distribution." It seems to us that such an idea is distinctly at war with the whole tendency of modern evolutionary thought, of whose application in social lines Comrade Buck has given us so many valuable examples.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Two important matters were acted upon by the convention of the International Typographical Union—one relating to the purely economic struggle and the other to the advanced political side. The Typographical Union, which is the oldest of the national organizations, was the first to give conciliation and arbitration a fair and general trial. But it looks as though the experiment has proven a failure—at least that impression is growing among the printers. The reasons are plain. The employers demand their own way in everything. For instance: In Seattle and Spokane, Wash., where the test cases took place that led to the rupture between the International Typographical Union and the Newspaper Publishers' Association upon the arbitration question the bosses started out as though it was a preconceived plan to make a farce of conciliation and arbitration. In Seattle the Union had made a request for an increase in wages and reduction in hours, claiming that living rates had advanced, which was just cause for higher wages, and that they had increased the output, which was a good reason why hours of labor could be reduced. Without attempting to controvert the facts presented the employers filed a counter proposition, demanding a reduction in wages and increase of hours of labor. Furthermore, they even had the audacity to ask that certain laws that had been adopted by 40,000 printers in a national referendum be made the subject of arbitration in their local contest. The Seattle Union requested that the questions go to the national commission, composed of President Lynch, of the Union, and President Driscoll, of the publishers. This the local bosses refused, whereupon the Union took the bull by the horns and enforced its new scale. Previous to this occurrence the printers of Spokane asked for an increase of wages. A monopolist controls the three newspapers, as well as "public opinion" largely in that city. The proposition went to an arbitration board composed of representatives of the printers, the newspapers and "the public." A preacher was the spokesman for "the public." Mr. Preacher was informed that he was expected to find for the newspapers, and he did as he was told. The printers' representative was even told that they did not need his signature to the agreement (?), and when the jug-handled contract was promulgated the workers refused to swallow it and went on strike, and then a loud howl went up that the International Typographical Union had "violated every principle of arbitration!" In New York city the newspaper printers also put in a request for higher wages or a reduction of hours; they also proved that living rates had increased and that their output was greater than ever. Here also a preacher (a bishop, by the way) was chosen as the third arbitrator. This gentleman, after considering the testimony, was forced to admit that prices of necessity had advanced and that the workers had increased their output, but, he argued, "the public" should have the benefits, as the printers were receiving "fair wages" and the employers "fair profits." In Minneapolis the employers also succeeded, by the aid of a politician, in securing advantages over the workers.

Taking their cue from their fellow publishers in the aforementioned cities, the newspaper proprietors of Denver have met the demands of the printers for higher wages with a counter demand for a reduction of wages and lengthening of hours of labor. It is international law that newspaper printers work but eight hours a day, but that makes no difference to the Denver bosses. They insist that the law should be repealed and the men should work nine hours. No doubt the publishers in other cities will pursue the same tactics in the future.

This is the situation that confronted the International Typographical Union convention which met in Washington. President Driscoll, of the Newspaper Publishers' Association, was present and received a hearing. In a carefully prepared statement, which was sent over the Associated Press wires verbatim, he attempted to show that the International Typographical Union, through its officers and local Unions, had violated the principles of arbitration. But after hearing the testimony of the national officers and local Unions, which was cut and garbled to suit the "molders of public opinion," the delegates by unanimous vote endorsed the position of their representatives and refused to recede an inch. It was freely declared that the employers violated every principle of justice and decency, and that if they desired to destroy conciliation and arbitration agreement and were looking for fight they would be accommodated. The whole question is now up to the Newspaper Publishers' Association, which seems to have become "paralyzed," and it is for them to say whether it shall be peace or war.

Another matter of general interest was the International Typographical Union convention's action on the advanced political proposition. By a parliamentary trick sprung at a late hour during the night session preceding the day of adjournment an endorsement of the principle of collective ownership was defeated by a vote of two to one, but the following morning, when a resolution came up for the appointment of a committee to consider the question of taxation and its relation to wages, an amendment was attached thereto to instruct the committee to investigate and report upon the advisability of nationalizing trusts and monopolies. This amendment, after some sharp and fast debate, was carried by 76 to 18. While the majority of delegates were unquestionably non-Socialists, still there was a strong sentiment in the convention in favor of taking advanced ground. As one of the national officers put it: "The bulk of our members know little about Socialism, but I believe the printers ought to be tolerant enough to give this great and growing principle an unprejudiced hearing, and if they find that it contains the merit that its advocates claim we will be the first to acknowledge it." There were vague rumors during the early part of the convention that my action in the New Orleans convention of the American Federation of Labor, in advocating Socialism contrary to the "muzzle" resolution adopted at the Cincinnati session a year ago, would be condemned, that I would be impeached, etc., but there was no basis for such yarns other than the ineffectual attempts of a few political skates and office-seekers who hung about the convention to create trouble, especially for the Socialists. The action of the American Federation of Labor delegation as a whole was unanimously endorsed.

* * *

New York.—America's metropolis is in bad shape from the labor standpoint, especially in the building trades. The attempt of the contractors to abolish the sympathy strike and minimize the power of the business agents of the unions has largely succeeded. Over a hundred thousand men were locked out early in the season, and they were informed that just as soon as their unions signed agreements that had been prepared by and were satisfactory to the employers they might return to work. At first only a few of the smaller unions signed, then gradually some of the larger ones broke away,

and at this writing only the bridge and structural iron workers are standing out. This is an important organization, and under ordinary circumstances could keep the building trades tied up to a large extent, but the capitalists are playing a trump card by forming an opposition union composed of a heterogeneous mob of professional scabs, ex-members, non-union men and some who had formerly worked at the trade, but went into other occupations, and finally a sprinkling of skilled men who became disgusted with the Parks method of conducting affairs. Parks, one of the union's business agents, is now on trial for blackmailing contractors, and some damaging testimony is being brought out. It is alleged that he has become rich and lives like a prince, owing to his ability as a grafter. Then, again, the expose in the Stonecutters' Union, an officer of which has been sent to the penitentiary for stealing a large sum of money, and rumors of crookedness in other organizations, have greatly discouraged the honest rank and file, while some of the deplorable jurisdiction fights and internal dissensions have also tended to weaken organized labor and arouse the suspicion of the great mass of workers who are not in unions. There will have to be a general shake-up and weeding out in the unions of New York, and that very soon, if the labor movement of this city is to go forward. Furthermore, since the employers have combined and are daily strengthening their associations, and, of course, are unanimously backed up by the daily press (except the *Volkszeitung*, the Socialist party daily), the workmen of New York are beginning to discover that it is necessary to secure control of the city's political machinery and use it for their betterment instead of being mere voting cattle for Tammany Hall and the Platt machine. Many of the active workers in all trades are joining the Socialist party or reading Socialist literature, and a prominent member of the party, who is usually careful and conservative in making estimates, predicted that the Socialist party would poll fully 40,000 votes this fall, or double the number of a year ago.

The thoughtful workmen of New York are awakening not only because their organizations are being attacked by employers' combines, or because of the brutality of the police and courts during strikes, or for the reason that some of the corruptionists in their own ranks have been feathering their own nests while howling to the honest rank and file to keep clean labor politics out of union affairs, but on account of a wider spread of intelligence and a desire to enjoy more of the comforts of life. The sober-minded workers observe this great city increasing in population at a tremendous rate, and their own quarters are becoming more cramped every month. Thousands of foreign laborers are pouring through Ellis Island each week and many more are coming in from surrounding cities and towns, many of whom are attracted by stories of high wages and boundless opportunities to make fortunes. Naturally rents are steadily going upward, as well as prices of food products, and those who are lucky enough to receive \$2.50 to \$4 per day find that there is nothing left in their pocketbooks at the end of the month, although they may have exercised the greatest care in expending their wages. The highest paid workers usually live in apartments of six to eight rooms, for which they pay \$18 to \$40 per month. Then they must add car fare, insurance, union dues and other necessary expenses. Clothing is high and food products can almost be seen advancing in price, especially where they must be purchased at retail and in dribblets. Such a thing as a worker owning his home here and stocking his cellar with potatoes, vegetables, meats, etc., is not even to be dreamed of. About 6 per cent of the capitalists of the city own the whole of Manhattan Island, and they can tax the balance of the people almost what they choose. The laboring class leads a hand to mouth existence and the wolf of hunger and poverty is always at the door. As these facts dawn upon the intellects of the workers who are capable of thinking they begin to wonder what all their shouting for Tammany and Platt has amounted to, and when they contrast

their own conditions with those of the political boodlers whom they have supported their disgust tends to lead them into new channels of thought and action. Hence, the near future belongs to Socialism in New York, and it is a reasonable prediction to make that the Socialists of the metropolis will elect city councilmen and members of the State Legislature inside of two years. The old party politicians are keeping an anxious eye upon the growing new party, and not the least important work of the Socialists from now on will be to successfully meet the schemes and methods of the wire-pullers and machine-builders who have been in control of governmental affairs so long and used that power to create an arrogant, plutocratic privileged class on one side and to hold an army of wage-slaves in subjection on the other.

NOTE.—Comrade Hayes has agreed to write regularly for the REVIEW while on his trip to Europe as fraternal delegate from the American Federation of Labor to the English Trade Union Congress.—EDITOR.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Bulgaria.

The Ninth National Congress of the Bulgarian Socialists showed a steady growth of Socialism in that country. The membership has grown from 2,180 in 1902 to 2,507 due-paying members in seventy-three organizations in 1903. An interesting phase of the report is the one relating to the education of the party membership. This shows that 116 had received university instruction, 545 intermediate school training, 1,785 had passed the primary grade, while only seventeen were wholly without scholastic training.

The party received 13,815 votes at the legislative elections of 1900; 13,283 in 1901, and 20,307 in 1902, when seven Socialist deputies were elected.

The party has organized popular schools for adults in many cities and villages. During the past year these have been attended by 416 regular students, of which 29 were women and 196 were members of the party. The income of our party during the past year was over \$1,500. Over 30,000 copies of an annual "almanach" were circulated during the same period.

The omnipresent question of "opportunism" occupied a large portion of the time of the convention. One faction of the party, led by Sakazoff, denied the existence of the class struggle and were calling for a union of all classes for the purpose of accomplishing some immediate reforms. This faction, like Bernstein at Lubeck and Millerand at Bordeaux, sought to avoid discussion by the Congress and declared that no "questions of principle" were involved, but only "personal quarrels between leaders." Nevertheless the Congress took up the subject. Towards the end of the debate three tendencies appeared. One, led by Markovsky, demanded that the party take the most radical steps to clear itself of all suspicion of opportunism. The second wished the Congress committed to the opportunist position. The third wished simply to place the party on record as opposed to opportunism, while leaving the individual members free to act as they wished. The last tendency prevailed and a resolution was adopted which denounced opportunism and reaffirmed the proletarian character of the party.

Hungary.

The National Congress of Hungarian Socialists, which has recently been held, contained 274 delegates, representing 165 communes. The Servian and Roumanian nationalities, which were wholly unrepresented at previous congresses, sent a number of delegates to this last gathering. Another interesting feature was the large representation from the agricultural districts.

During the past year the party has been carrying on an active campaign for universal suffrage, and a petition to this end received more than 170,-

000 signatures. Great activity in propaganda work has been displayed. Public meetings with immense audiences, reaching at times to between 15,000 and 20,000 persons, have been held. The press has grown until there are nine Socialist periodicals. Several of the propaganda pamphlets in the Hungarian language reached a circulation of between 10,000 and 25,000 copies, while some of those in the Servian language reached over 6,000 circulation, which is much more than is usually attained by the bourgeois pamphlets in that language.

The *Arbeiter Zeitung*, of Vienna, tells of a celebration by the Hungarian Socialists of the enactment of a law of which they had secured the passage abolishing all Sunday labor in all mercantile pursuits in Budapest, and providing that mercantile establishments in the other portions of Hungary could only be open after 10 A. M. This is the result of a three years' agitation, in which 130,000 leaflets were circulated, a large number of public meetings held and many of the Socialists suffered imprisonment for taking part in the movement.

The *Neues Pester Journal* gives another view of the Socialist activity in Hungary in a news item describing a Socialist meeting, at which over ten thousand persons were present, which was held on the 21st of June. The account has the following suggestive conclusion: "The meeting, which had continued for over two hours, concluded. The Socialists dispersed with absolute order and the police found no reason to interfere."

Germany.

The more the election statistics are studied the more reasons the Socialists find for gratification, and the other parties for dismay and anger. The *Reichs-Anzeiger* has just discovered that not only did the Socialists gain from nearly all the other parties, but it succeeded in doing what has been for several years considered impossible—rousing the great non-voting mass to take an interest in political affairs. This paper publishes the following table, showing the increasing percentage of the whole voting population which is supporting the Socialists:

Year.	Per cent qualified voters.	Per cent actual voters.
1874.....	4.0	6.7
1877.....	5.5	9.1
1878.....	4.8	7.5
1881.....	3.4	6.1
1884.....	5.9	9.7
1887.....	7.8	10.1
1890.....	13.9	19.6
1893.....	16.8	23.2
1898.....	18.4	27.1
1903.....	24.1	31.7

Vorwaerts has recently secured and published a secret circular issued by an organization formed to abolish universal suffrage, which gives an interesting picture of the panic which the approach of Socialist victory is producing among the capitalists of Germany. A letter which accompanies the circular (the first edition of which is said to have been 1,000,000 copies) calls upon the capitalists of Germany to raise a fund for the purpose of fighting equal suffrage. This letter has as its opening sentence a quotation from Joubert to the effect that "Politics is the art of leading the masses, not whither they *would*, but where they *should* go." The circular proposes a sort of graduated suffrage modeled on the Belgian plan, giving additional votes to employers of labor and graduates of universities.

The emperor has given utterance to the very Delphic observation that "The Social Democracy is a phenomenon whose development must be awaited; it is not necessary at this time to deal with it." Just what this means every one is at liberty to imagine for himself.

The articles in the capitalist papers are about equally divided between those declaring that the Social Democracy has changed its character, and is now nothing but a Liberal party that will soon die, and those declaring that the Social Democracy is about to precipitate a violent revolution and proposes to overturn every social institution. Sometimes both kinds of articles appear in the same paper, and it is hard to tell which is the most amusing.

These same papers are amusing themselves in debating with great gravity the question which Edouard Bernstein raised as to whether the Socialists should accept the position of second vice-president of the Reichstag. *The Freisinnige Zeitung* declares that under no condition would the majority permit Singer to take this place. Indeed, this seems to be the general position. One cannot but feel that this is a high tribute to Comrade Singer. On the other hand, it should be something to cause Bernstein to blush that all agree that he would be especially acceptable to the capitalist class of Germany.

Italy.

The divergent tendencies within the Socialist Party have at last led to open division. Led by Turati, the Socialist Federation of Milan has left the party. The *Vorwaerts* correspondent declares that the dispute seems to be largely personal, although the seceders represent the opportunist wing. The branch of the party located in Rome has demanded the expulsion of Turati and his followers from the party, as there was some doubt as to whether the withdrawal of the organization from affiliation with the central authority really placed its members outside the party. In order to arouse as little antagonism as possible Enrico Ferri, the editor of *Avanti*, has declared his intention to keep the controversy out of that paper, except through the publication of such news items regarding it as may be rendered necessary.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Place of Industries in Elementary Education. Katherine Elizabeth Dopp. The University of Chicago Press. Cloth. 208 pp. \$1.25.

Socialists have frequently pointed out that the most modern pedagogy is simply adapting the philosophy of Socialism (generally unconsciously so far as the writers in this field are concerned) to education. This book is an excellent illustration of this fact. With a few unimportant exceptions it is simply an exposition and application of well-known principles of Socialist philosophy. The principle of economic determinism constitutes the whole foundation of the work, and is thus stated in the introduction: "From the remotest to the most recent times, in the simplest as well as in the most highly organized societies, industry has been a dominant force in the up-building and maintaining of social structures." The outline and object is stated to be "an attempt to bring together from the domain of education on the one hand, and of anthropology, sociology and history on the other, ideas that will mutually reinforce each other. . . . In order to secure a basis for the work it has seemed best to consider, on the one hand, the several stages of industrial development in the race with reference to the educational significance of each, and, on the other, the successive periods in the development of the child. In the consideration of an industrial epoch an attempt is made to discover (1) some of the more important interactions that take place between man and his natural and social environments; (2) how these result in different forms of industry, and (3) how forms of industry influence the social organization of people and the development of the sciences and arts. The attempt is also made to show that there is more than an accidental relation between the technique represented in the tool and the intellectual, moral and social condition of the people." The second chapter consists of a survey of industrial epochs, largely founded on Carl Bücher's "Industrial Evolution." The third, on "The Origins of the Attitudes that Underlie Industry," is an examination of the psychical effects of these stages as seen in the mental makeup of the present child. Each stage through which the race has passed has left its impress upon mankind in the form of inherited mental traits and attitudes. In obedience to the well-known law that the individual in his growth reproduces the history of the race from which he sprang, or, to express it in technical terms, that ontogenetic and philogenetic development are parallel, it follows that the education of the child should be adapted to the various social stages through which, so to speak, the child is passing in his development. The fourth chapter deals with "Practical Applications" of these principles, and, although of greatest value to the teacher, need not concern us here.

While almost the entire attitude of the book is Socialistic, yet the author seems to be wholly ignorant of the fact that she is covering ground that has often been treated before, and it is almost unnecessary to say that there are no references to the work of Socialist writers on the subjects treated. As usual also, the most important phase of her subject, and one which would

modify many of her positions, is untouched. This is the doctrine of the class struggle. She does not see that this constitutes an insurmountable obstacle to adoption of the methods of education which she advocates. It is safe to say that were the schools of any city to adopt the principles here laid down capitalism in that locality would soon be doomed. Just imagine a capitalist-controlled school system basing its whole method of instruction on the materialistic interpretation of history, where slavery was treated from the point of view given in the following quotations from this work:

"The advantages of agriculture as a means of furnishing an abundant supply of food from a small area soon became apparent. Man's labor acquired a value hitherto unknown. Captives in war were now too valuable to put to death. They were enslaved and compelled to carry on agriculture under the supervision of their conquerors.

* * * * *

"In the early stages of slavery there was little difference between the position of master and slave. Both did the same kind of work. With the increase in the number of slaves and in the property of the master it became necessary to organize the slave labor in gangs with overseers. Labor thus became compulsory, and disgrace was attached to the unfortunate members of society who became the victims of a stronger power. Society was cleft in twain, and the chasm has not yet been completely bridged. From this time labor became distasteful to the leisure class, not so much on its own account, as because of its association with an inferior class and with domesticated animals. . . . It became irksome to the slave because the problem was external to his own interests and needs. He was no longer free to choose his problems or to control the conditions under which he carried on his work. . . . Succeeding stages of culture have tended to perpetuate the distinctions between the leisure and the industrial classes first drawn in the pastoral and agricultural stages. Labor, which at first was a free manifestation of the whole being and the part of each member of society, came to be a forced expression of muscular movement of certain members of society.

* * * * *

"Industry, enriched by the contributions of science, becomes more and more complex. The end becomes farther and farther removed. The worker, no longer able to perceive the whole process of production, has need of a greater consciousness of collective life than ever before. His activity is no longer a personal occupation that brings him honor as in the period of house-industry, nor a civic function, the actions and interactions of which are within the range of his perception, as in the period of handicraft labor, but a social function in a national if not a cosmopolitan society.

* * * * *

"The industrial development that has advanced from being a function of the household to that of the city, and finally to that of the nation and nations of the earth, needs to be paralleled by an enlargement of social consciousness from the personal, through the municipal, to such a consciousness as recognizes the brotherhood of all men."

Just how she expects this to be done it is necessary to say the author does not state. This defect in the line of thought the Socialist supplies. Remembering this fact, it is not too much to say that the book is really a contribution to Socialist as well as educational literature. It is one which every Socialist who is interested in education, and all Socialists should be so interested, should read. Those who are engaged in municipal work especially should make themselves familiar with its contents, for in few fields can Socialists accomplish more when elected to municipal offices than in the field of education.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

HOW WE PUBLISH SOCIALIST BOOKS

The last four pages of the August number of the International Socialist Review contain a condensed alphabetical list of a hundred and fifty books, most of which have been published within the last four years by the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company. Averaging the small books with the large ones, it is safe to say that this list represents an investment of about \$100 for each title, or about \$15,000.00.

All this has been done in spite of the fact that when in the spring of 1899 we began the publication of the literature of scientific socialism, we were without cash capital (as we are still) and were carrying a heavy load of debt. Meanwhile no one has made any large subscription of capital, and while we have sold great quantities of socialist literature, it has been at prices barely covering the cost of printing and handling, and yet we have doubled several times over the supply of socialist literature available for propaganda in America. How has it been done?

The answer is in the fact that our co-operative plan for supplying books to stockholders at cost has been enthusiastically accepted by the socialist party of America, not by any official vote, which would be unnecessary and unadvisable, but by the separate action of about one hundred socialist locals and six hundred individual socialists, who have each subscribed ten dollars to the capital stock of our company, for the double purpose of aiding us to circulate the literature of international socialism, and of securing their own supplies of this literature at cost.

We can not publish a list of these stockholders, for the reason that many of them are so situated that they might lose their jobs or otherwise suffer injury if their connection with the Social-

ist Party became public. We therefore publish merely the places where the stockholders are located. Boldface indicates that the local of the town thus distinguished is itself a stockholder.

LOCATION OF STOCKHOLDERS.

ALABAMA — Branchville, Fairhope, Phenix.

ALASKA—Valdez.

ARIZONA—Bisbee, Chloride, Flagstaff, Hillside, Jerome (two), Phoenix, Saford, Tucson.

ARKANSAS—Hot Springs, Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA—Alameda, Benicia, Berkeley, Cedarville, Clarksburg, Colusa, Crockett, Dixon, Dos Palos, Dunsmuir, Eureka, Glen Ellen, Goleta, Grass Valley, Hayden Hill, Haywards, Healdsburg, Hemet, Lemoore, Los Angeles (eight), Morgan Hill, Oakland (two), Oxnard, Petaluma, Red Bluff, Redlands, Redondo, Rio Vista, RIVERSIDE (two), Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, (three), San Francisco (four), San Jose, San Marcos, Santa Ana, Santa Barbara, Sespe, Sawtelle, South Berkeley, Tulare, Vallejo, Westminster.

COLORADO—Buena Vista, Colorado City, Conrad, Cripple Creek, Denver (eight), Gunnison, Leadville (two), Newcastle, Ordway, Sterling, Telluride.

CONNECTICUT — Berlin, Bridgeport (two), Gildersleeve, Hartford, New Haven (two), Reynolds Bridge, Waterbury.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Georgetown, Washington (six).

FLORIDA—Gilmore, Key West, Kissimmee, Miami, Milton, Pensacola, St. Augustine (two), Tampa (two), West Palm Beach.

GEORGIA—Fitzgerald, Macon, Ruskin.

IDAHO—Boise, Burke, Garnet, Mullan, Moscow, Noble, Pocatello, Wallace.

ILLINOIS—Canton, Caseyville, Chicago, (forty-five), Chicago Heights, Dwight, Elgin, Evanston, Galesburg, Glen Carbon, Glen Ellyn (two), Grossdale, Illinois, Jacksonville, Kankakee, Keithsburg, Lake Forest, Leclair, McNabb, Melrose Park (two), Middle Grove, Oak Park, Pana, Peotone, Quincy, Rockford, Secor, Steger, Streator, Winnetka, Woodburn.

INDIANA—Anderson, Andrews, Boonville, Brazil, Butler, Evansville, Greenfield,

- Greensburg, Greensfork, Huntington, Indianapolis (two), Marion (two), Peru, South Bend, Whiting.
- INDIAN TERRITORY—Krebs.
- IOWA—Ames, Avery, Cedar Rapids (two), Clarinda, Davenport (three), Decorah, Des Moines (two), Dubuque, Independence, Lenox, Little Rock, Logan, Lyons, Muscatine, Ryan, St. Ansgar, Shelby, Sigourney, Sioux City, Van Horn (two).
- KANSAS—Abilene, Beloit, Clay Center, Darlow, Eron, Fuller, Galena, Geuda Springs, Girard, Herington, Hillsboro, Kansas City (three), La Cygne, Lyons, Mulberry, Oketo, Osage City, Rosedale, Topeka.
- KENTUCKY—Augusta, Covington, Louisville (four), Newport, Science Hill, Spottsville.
- LOUISIANA—New Orleans.
- MAINE—Bath, Intervale, Lewiston, Portland.
- MARYLAND—Baltimore (two).
- MASSACHUSETTS—Boston (five), Brighton, Chelsea, Clinton, Dorchester (two), East Boston, Everett, Fall River, Haverhill, Lawrence, Lynn (two), Newton (two), Northboro, Plymouth, Springfield (two), State Farm, Taunton, Vineyard Haven, Ware, West Fitchburg, West Newbury, Worcester.
- MICHIGAN—Adrian, Allegan, Battle Creek (three), Benton Harbor (two), Detroit (two), Eaton, Rapids, Flint, Ithaca, Kalamazoo (two), Laurium, Grand Ledge, Grand Rapids, Holly, Ludington, Manistee, Saginaw, St. Charles, St. Clair, Ypsilanti.
- MINNESOTA—Ada, Austin, Crookston, Fergus Falls, Holdingford, Hubbard, Lindstrom, Minneapolis (five), Montevideo, Noble (Local Angus), St. Anthony Park, St. Paul (two), Tracy, Two Harbors, Ullman, Willmar, Zumbrota.
- MISSISSIPPI—Jackson.
- MISSOURI—Bever, Kansas City (three), New Madrid, Paris, Pleasant Hill, St. Joseph, St. Louis (nine), West Plains.
- MONTANA—Aldridge, Anaconda, Billings, Bozeman, Butte (six), Chico, Fort Logan, Great Falls, Helena, Lewiston, Livingston, Monarch, Pony.
- NEBRASKA—Blair, Columbus, Fairfield, Grand Island, Leavitt, Lincoln, Omaha (two), Simeon, South Omaha, Thurston.
- NEW HAMPSHIRE—Chesham, Concord, Contoocook, Dover, Manchester (two).
- NEW JERSEY—Arlington (three), East Orange, Camden, Moorestown, Newark, Paterson, Trenton, Woodbine.
- NEW MEXICO—Albuquerque, Roswell.
- NEW YORK—Albany, Arkport, Auburn, Bloomingburgh, Brooklyn (three), Buffalo, Catskill, Cold Spring, Kenwood, Mount Vernon, New Rochelle, New York (twenty-six), Northport, Peekskill, Port Jervis, Port Richmond, Rhinebeck, Richfield Springs, Rochester (three), Schenectady, Yonkers.
- NORTH CAROLINA—Asheville, Cherryville.
- NORTH DAKOTA—Chaffee, Devil's Lake, Fargo (two), Guelph, Mayville, Milton, Tagus, Valley City.
- OHIO—Ashtabula, Burton City, Canton, Cincinnati (four), Cleveland (four), Conneaut, Corning, Crestline, Dayton, Fostoria, Hamilton, Latty, Martin's Ferry, Massillon, Maynard, Mechanicsburg, Sandusky, Springfield, Toledo (five), Youngstown, Zanesville.
- OKLAHOMA—Bedford, Carmen, Cereal, Geary, Guthrie (two), Kingfisher, Lacey, Medford (two), Nardin, Oklahoma City, Shawnee.
- OREGON—Albany, Baker City, Echo, Eugene, Medford, Oregon City, Portland (three), Shaw, Vale, Vernonia.
- PENNSYLVANIA—Allegheny (two), Allentown, Braddock, Brownsville, East Pittsburg, Erie (two), Hughesville, Leechburg, Lehigh, Newcastle (two), Philadelphia (eight), Pittsburg (four), Reading (two), Renfrew, Rodi, Rowenna, Russell, Springchurch, Titusville, Wilkes Barre, York.
- RHODE ISLAND—Providence (two).
- SOUTH DAKOTA—Aberdeen, Sioux Falls.
- TENNESSEE—Knoxville (three), Nashville (two), Et. Elmo (Local Chattanooga).
- TEXAS—Bonham, Dallas, Fort Worth, Gonzales, Houston, Palestine, San Antonio, Toyah, Turnersville.
- UTAH—Logan, Murray, Ogden, Park City, Plateau, Salt Lake City, Sunshine.
- VERMONT—Burlington.
- VIRGINIA—Newport News, Richmond.
- WASHINGTON—Arlington, Ballard, Bremerton, Centralia, Charleston, Edison, Fairhaven, Hoquiam, Lynden, Olympia, Port Angeles, Puyallup, Redmond, Ritzville, Seattle (three), Silvana, Snoqualmie, Spokane (three), Sprague, Stanwood, Tacoma, Waterville, Yelm.
- WEST VIRGINIA—Dallison, McMechen, Pennsboro.
- WISCONSIN—Deer Park, Elroy, Madison (two), Marinette, Milwaukee (four), Two Rivers, Wausau, Whitewater (two).
- WYOMING—Cheyenne, Laramie (two), Rock Springs, Sheridan, Lusk.
- BRITISH COLUMBIA—Nanaimo, Phoenix Revelstoke, Slokan (two), Vancouver, Victoria.
- MANTOBA—Winnipeg (two).
- ONTARIO—Applehill, Collingwood, Dublin, Malton, Mindemoya, Simcoe, Kaga-wong.
- CUBA—La Gloria (two).
- ENGLAND—Salford.
- NEWFOUNDLAND—St. Johns.
- SCOTLAND—Falsley.
- DECEASED OR ADDRESS UNKNOWN, sixteen.

Special Prices on Literature to Stockholders

International Socialist Review.—Single copies, 5c each, renewal of stockholder's own subscription, 50c, renewals forwarded for others, 90c. Subscription post cards, each good for the *Review* one year to a new name, will be sold to stockholders at 25c each until Dec. 31, 1903, after which they will be 50c each. These cards are not good for

Chicago or foreign subscriptions without the payment of 20c additional for postage.

Madden Library.—One cent a copy, 50c a hundred by mail; \$4.00 a thousand by express at purchaser's expense.

Pocket Library of Socialism, 2 cents a copy on all orders for less than a hundred; \$1.00 a hundred by mail; \$8.00 a thousand by express at purchaser's expense.

All other paper covered books published by us.—Fifty per cent discount if we prepay postage or expressage; sixty per cent discount if purchaser pays expressage. For example, a ten cent book is 5c if prepaid by us, otherwise 4c; a twenty-five cent book 12½c if prepaid by us, otherwise 10c; etc.

Cloth bound books.—Forty per cent discount if sent by mail or express at our expense; fifty per cent discount if sent by express at the expense of purchaser.

These discounts apply only to books published or imported by ourselves, and included in our catalogue. We do not solicit orders for books of other publishers, though as a matter of accommodation we endeavor to obtain them for our stockholders when the full advertised price is sent with order. All book orders should be accompanied by cash, except that when stockholders prefer, they may make a deposit with us and order books against it from time to time, thus saving the trouble and expense of obtaining many small postal orders.

A Dollar a Month Pays for Stock

Where possible, it is of course less trouble on both sides to pay the full ten dollars for stock at the time of subscribing. But our offer of books at cost to stockholders is made for the benefit of just the ones who are not likely to have ten dollars to spare at one time, and we have therefore developed a system by which we can receive a stock subscription if accompanied by one dollar, the rest of the money to be paid in nine monthly installments of one dollar each. A subscriber who has paid his first dollar will be entitled to all privileges of a stockholder except voting, provided he keeps up his payments at the end of each month as agreed.

No dividends are guaranteed, and while the question of declaring dividends

in future will be in the hands of the stockholders to decide, it is not likely that any will be declared, since the amount coming to each stockholder would in any case be trifling, and it will probably be thought preferable to use the earnings of the company to increase the variety and reduce the prices of socialist literature, after the debt is paid off.

Four years ago, the company was heavily indebted to printers, binders and paper dealers, and its notes, discounted by these creditors in Chicago banks, and maturing at frequent intervals, were a constant source of anxiety, while the rate of interest paid was high. Today, little debt remains except that to our own stockholders, and most of it is at five per cent interest, while the few loans at a higher rate can be taken up as soon as the capital is available.

The present capitalization of the company is limited to ten thousand dollars. We shall soon, however, ask our stockholders to vote on a proposition for increasing it to twenty-five thousand dollars. This will enable us to extend the privileges of stockholders to fifteen hundred more socialist locals and individuals, and we shall offer the stock only in single shares.

This co-operative publishing company with its seven hundred stockholders already comes far nearer to being under the control of the Socialist Party of America than any other publishing house, and the new issue of stock will be offered only to socialists, and only one share to each. Special efforts will be made to secure subscriptions from the locals of the Socialist Party, since thus the profit on books sold by the company at cost and by the stockholder at retail will go directly to the benefit of the party, and every party member will have an added motive for pushing the sale of literature.

The wide distribution of the stock over the whole country will ensure against the control of the publishing house falling into the hands of any local clique with factional ends to serve. The present directors, Charles H. Kerr, A. M. Simons and Marcus Hitch, will remain in charge of the affairs of the company only so long as they satisfy the stockholders that they are using the resources of the company to the best of their ability for circulating the literature of International socialism, and when any of them become for any reason unable

to discharge the duties of directors, their places will be filled by socialists commanding the confidence of the rank and file of the party.

Is *your* Local already a stockholder? If not, bring the matter up at your next meeting and get action taken.

Are *you* a stockholder? If not, send on the ten dollars that will pay for a share, or the dollar for the first monthly payment, and have the satisfaction of knowing that you are a part of the co-operative company that is keeping the movement supplied with the literature of clear-cut, scientific socialism.

And if you are a stockholder, make sure that the privilege conferred by your stock certificate, of buying literature at cost, is utilized. If you have no time to sell books, perhaps there is another socialist near you who has the time but has not the money to pay for the stock or even for the books. You can buy the books for him and let him pay for them as fast as sold, and you will thus both be helping in the most effective propaganda. For it can not be repeated too often that to get a non-socialist to pay his own money for a socialist book is ten times as effective as to give him a book. What you give him he will look askance at, wondering what your motive is in offering it to him. What he buys he is going to read, so as to get his money's worth.

All this has been addressed to those who can help only with small sums. We can use large sums also, but not on a plan that will give a controlling interest to the large investor. If you have money from which under capitalistic conditions you need to draw an income while you live, and would like the money to be used ultimately for the spread of socialism, we can give good security for the carrying out of a contract that will ensure you a life income of six per cent on whatever money you invest with us.

Walt Whitman's Works

Whitman lived and died before economic conditions were ripe for an American socialist movement. Yet Whitman is distinctively the poet of American socialism. He foresaw the coming social change and rejoiced in it. He accepted the socialist foundation-thought of historical materialism, and upon it built up a nobler creed than theologians ever dreamed of. His writings to-day are a powerful inspiration for those who are in the thick of the fight for the coming revolution.

No edition of Whitman has thus far been easily accessible to socialists. Our co-operative company has therefore brought out a handsome library edition, about 350 large pages, printed in clear type on extra paper, and substantially bound in cloth, with gold lettering on the back. Our retail price is 75c, postage included, to stockholders, 45c by mail or 37½c by express at purchaser's expense. The best introduction to the poet's writings is the study by Mila Tupper Maynard entitled "Walt Whitman," price \$1.00, with usual discounts to stockholders.

Socialism and the Organized Labor Movement

A booklet by May Wood Simons bearing this title will be issued about the middle of September as number 39 of the Pocket Library of Socialism. It traces the historical growth of the trade union movement, and shows the inevitable tendency of the trade unions toward political action through the Socialist Party. Advance orders, to be filled on publication, should be sent in at once, since this booklet will be one that will be of unusual interest to union men everywhere, and it will be one of the most effective socialist propaganda pamphlets ever issued. Address

Charles H. Kerr & Company, Publishers

56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago

THE REAL FACTS ABOUT RUSKIN UNIVERSITY

So many conflicting rumors have been circulated regarding the past, present and future of Ruskin University, that I believe the Socialists of the United States would like an impartial statement of the facts in the case. By way of preface I desire to explain that I am in no way connected with the management of the university, while I have had the best of facilities for personal observation of its work and acquaintance with its officers and students, since my residence is at Glen Ellyn, where it is located, and I am financial secretary of Local Glen Ellyn of the Socialist Party, the membership of which consists largely of Ruskin students.

While the Ruskin College was operated at Trenton, Mo., Walter Vrooman was its chief financial support. His connection with the institution was definitely ended at least three months ago. Socialists can hardly be blamed for looking askance at Ruskin while Vrooman was a director. He is a generous, whole-souled fellow with the greatest enthusiasm for Socialism as he understands it; but he is hopelessly erratic, and he refuses to work inside the Socialist Party, because he wants to be dictator in whatever is doing. He is out now and it is needless to discuss him further.

Ruskin University is an amalgamation of various schools, among which are Ruskin College, which removed from Trenton under the direction of George McA. Miller, and the Chicago Law School, at the head of which was J. J. Tobias. This Tobias became the chancellor of the university, in charge of its Chicago office in the Schiller building, while Miller, with the title of Dean, was in actual charge of the class work at Glen Ellyn.

An essential part of the University work which had been agreed upon by all parties concerned before the consolidation was that economics and sociology should be taught by Socialists, from the Socialist point of view, not, however, excluding their presentation from the capitalistic point of view also if found desirable. As a matter of fact the only course on these subjects in the spring term of 1903 was a course of lectures on Socialism by May Wood Simons. I had the privilege of listening to most of her lectures and found them instructive and stimulating in a high degree. They were attended by a large proportion of the

students, and had a marked effect in clearing their ideas.

Toward the end of the spring term Chancellor Tobias evidently became alarmed at the growing prominence of the Socialist thought in the University, and resolved to check it if possible. He gave out interviews and newspaper letters falsely asserting that a small group of students was alone responsible for any Socialist tendency on the part of the University, and he undertook from that time to get rid of Socialist students and also of Dean Miller.

An animated though not noisy contest ensued for the control of the Glen Ellyn property and I am happy to announce that Miller has won out and that under his direction scientific Socialism will be taught at Ruskin by A. M. Simons, May Wood Simons, and probably soon by other members of the Socialist Party. Miller himself has not thus far been a party member, although he votes the Socialist ticket, but the logic of events is bringing him to us irresistibly. When he comes into the party organization it will be to stay. I have known him for years and know that he is a man to tie to.

Ruskin College may continue to affiliate with the various Chicago schools that with it made up Ruskin University, but it will have its own board of trustees, and its own local government, so that there will in future be no interference with its established policy of teaching the truth on social problems. It is the purpose of the college to furnish its students with employment, for a sufficient portion of their time to enable them to earn their board and room rent. Courses, both resident and correspondence, will be given by Mr. and Mrs. Simons as originally announced in history, economics and sociology. I can unhesitatingly commend the school as one to which Socialist parents can send their sons and daughters from fourteen years up, with the assurance that their minds will not be perverted by the capitalistic atmosphere such as surrounds most colleges. It is also the best possible place for a young workingman who desires to get a broad education while earning his own living.

It appears that inquiries from Socialists addressed to Ruskin University have been deliberately neglected by Tobias, who received the mail. To ensure getting a prompt answer address inquiries personally to Geo. McA. Miller, Glen Ellyn, Ill. The fall term opens September 15.

CHARLES H. KERR.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV

OCTOBER, 1903

NO. 4

New Tactics.

OUR opponents are once again pricking up their long ears. Quite in keeping with our usual custom, we have started an animated discussion just in time for our Dresden convention, and are carrying it on with our habitual spirited frankness. We are once again exchanging blows, and our enemies are anxiously watching to see whether that giant, the Socialist Party, will at last fall to pieces now, whether we will ourselves accomplish that which neither the hatred nor the cunning, neither the persecutions nor the temptations, of the enemies have been able to consummate. Of course, the hopes of our enemies are in vain. But the question suggests itself: "Is it necessary and appropriate to give rise to such hopes?" A man whom we all honor and esteem (comrade Bebel) has recently published in the *Vorwaerts* the angry words that "the time of hushing and mutual farce playing in the party is over." We, and with us probably the majority of the comrades, have asked ourselves with surprise, on reading these words: "How now? Those passionate discussions of the past years that shrank from strong expression and adjusted the internal differences in the party in the broadest daylight, were they nothing but hushing and farce playing?" In a certain sense we, too, admit that we play a little at farce comedy in the party and that we should make an end of it. We love to treat one another as adversaries, when we know full well that we are united for life and death by the same ideals, the same struggles, the same conviction and the feeling that our immortal soul is our immortal cause. We are a community bound together by a thousand indestructible ties—and yet we are so fond of creating the impression that the party consists of irreconcilable elements. At the same time, it is a proof of our

A reply of "Vorwaerts," August 30, 1903, which escaped the American Associated Press.

strength that we alone dare to express openly what would disrupt every other party.

If our party education is still lacking in perfection here or there, it is in the matter of party discussions. We are wont to rail impatiently at the theoreticians, although we are very proud of the theoretical fundament of our party. And yet we show a surprisingly small power of resistance against theoretical discussions which are not due to any internal necessity. The thing then grows like an avalanche, and in a short while it seems as if we had nothing better to do than to talk of the most indifferent matters, simply because it has pleased some theorizer to call attention to them. As it is only human to show personal likes and dislikes on such an occasion, when impulsive misgivings and the natural desire to carry a point enter into the question, the discussion often assumes an asperity which would only be justified, if vital principles of the party were at stake. A whimsical notion thus becomes a great principle or a terrible symptom of dangerous undercurrents. The popular, but not very useful, game of playing tag with the terms "principle" and "tactics" is diligently practiced. The worst of it is that in so doing we are wasting the time that might better be employed in the solution of weightier problems. Every one has the right in our party to get rid of his foolish notions by putting them into the party press and airing them in party meetings, and he must not be deprived of this human right, even if it serves as the only means of earning a reputation in the *bourgeois* ranks, or even of gaining the halo of a statesman and a smart and independent thinker. It might be desirable in such cases that many party editors should show a greater sense of responsibility by estimating in advance the probable effect of some literary notions and making use of their editorial duty of being the cool counsellors of hotheaded correspondents.

There is no justification for speaking in this new discussion of the "good old tactics" or prophesying the coming of a "new" tactics. The Socialist Party has rather arrived at a perfectly clear conception of the only possible tactics, especially during recent years, after a generation of hard struggles. There is neither an old, nor a new tactics. We have only THE tactics.

The tactics which the German Socialist Party is following did not fall from the clouds, but have been gradually acquired. It is not a sign of deep thought to refer to tactical problems with the more confusing than enlightening terms of radicalism and opportunism, marxism and revisionism, or whatever may be the names of intellectual sluggers. The fundamental principle of the tactics of the German Socialist Party is unalterable: it is the independent political action of the revolutionary proletariat resulting from the class struggle. But there have always been differ-

ences of opinion about the correct application of this principle, until the Socialist activity of recent years has clarified and unified our ideas on this point. The tactical problem lies solely in the connection of fundamental principles with the requirements of the practical politics of the day, of the situation to be dealt with for the time being.

This problem was also given for the bourgeois parties, but they have not succeeded in solving it. The pseudo-democratic liberalism started out by sacrificing all considerations of actual politics to the fundamental principles. Its tactics became a mere hollow demonstrative abstinence, which, e. g., led the liberalism of the fifties to yield to the new junker aristocracy that owed its existence to violations of the law. But this same liberalism ended by abandoning all fundamental principles and giving itself up to the shortsighted anarchism of ephemeral politics. Politics became a business with them.

Difficult as it is for the bourgeois parties to harmonize principle and practical politics, the difficulties increase still more for the Socialist Party in the same measure in which our fundamental demands assume the dimensions of a granite structure encompassing and transforming the world, a structure from which not a single stone can be broken and which towers above the bourgeois reform ideas, confined by their national and temporal limits, and representing only a loose collection of suggestions for reform.

It goes without saying that the Socialist Party could not solve in a single day this thorny problem of establishing internal unity between principle and practical politics, and that without contradiction and friction. There were vacillations and mistakes, we felt our way and experimented, until finally the problem was admirably solved, ripening in the course of historical development.

At the end of the sixties, the participation of the Socialist Party in the reichstag's elections was still a moot question. And when we finally took part, unwillingly enough, we thought that it was irreconcilable with our demonstrative agitation to make laws together with the bourgeois parties, to join, e. g., in the demand for industrial legislation. But this sterile attitude, while resolved upon, was never carried out. The Socialist mind was much too eager to work and did not permit itself to be crowded out of the daily work of society. We have only to recall the memory of the heated struggle over our tactics in the second balloting, the resolution of the national convention forbidding Socialists to vote for the radical candidates, and the opposition to the participation of our reichstag's representatives in the convention of seniors. In 1885, a resolution was adopted in Frankfurt, reminding our representatives that their practical work in the legislatures had very little value, and that their agitational

work was most essential. The fight about the advisability of participating in the elections for the city councils was especially animated. In a great mass meeting at Berlin the most embittered struggle took place. One comrade said: "We don't want any half-way work. Anyway, it is a violation of the Socialist program to take part openly in a class election." An advocate of participation declared that those who opposed them were police spies. The following resolution was finally adopted:

"Whereas, The expenditure of intellectual and material strength in the participation in the municipal elections stands in no proportion to the benefits to be derived therefrom; and

"Whereas, Experience has sufficiently shown that the conquest of a few seats in the city council does not assist the rising development of the working class, while it opens the door to unscrupulous office hunters and authority grabbers,

"Resolved, That we decline to take part in the municipal elections."

That was an example of the "good old tactics," even if the resolution was declared unfortunate after more deliberate consideration.

The last great tactical struggle arose over the question of participating in the landtag's elections. In 1893, it was decided not to take part in them, especially because "it is contrary to the established principles of the party to compromise with our enemies during elections, as this inevitably leads to demoralization, and to schisms and dissensions in our own ranks." But it was recommended to carry on an active propaganda for universal, equal, direct, and secret ballots in the landtag's elections. One of the speakers declared: "Compromises are treason; they sacrifice the principles of the party." Nobody declared in favor of participation at that time. The resolution may have been quite correct at that moment, but its justification was incorrect. For in a matter of compromise, everything depends on the question who is the leader. For a small party, compromises easily become dangerous, and make it subject to its enemies. But if that same party has grown strong and takes the leadership so that it can make its own conditions, then there is no longer any danger, and it would be suicide to abstain from political action, even under the most unfavorable election laws. In this way a resolution which may have been all right in 1893 becomes a grievous error in the course of time. Today, there is hardly any difference of opinion as far as participation in the elections is concerned, and they are now considered as the best means of starting a live agitation.

With the settlement of the question of the participation in the landtag's elections, the last tactical question has been solved.

There is no other possible question of tactics on this field. For participation in a bourgeois government is out of the question in Germany. We have established complete harmony between principle and political tactics. We have learned the art of grasping every advantage for the proletariat, without sacrificing one particle of our fundamental principles. We are working in every field, penetrating into all institutions, but we do not think for a moment of trading or sacrificing the birthright of our democratic and Socialist demands for the sake of momentary advantages. This is THE clear and conscious tactics of the Socialist Party, which is not the "good old" one, neither does it require any revision.

It seems almost as if it was due to the overconfidence in our sense of unity that has prompted some subtle party writer to place the question of the vice-presidency on the order of business of our public discussions. Whoever has read the above historical reminiscences will not wonder at the fact that this paltry apology for a problem has again assumed the dimensions of a "symptom" or even of a "principle."

Now, it is perfectly plain that this question of the vice-presidency does not belong to that class of important discussions which we have formerly had in the party. It is simply a notion. It is not a question for the Socialist Party at all, but at best a question of parliamentary self-respect for the bourgeois parties. For apart from the question of going to court, the matter is entirely indifferent to us as far as practical consequences are concerned.

Then, too, the bourgeois parties do not intend to satisfy our claim. True, in 1895, after the presidential strike of the conservative-national parties in consequence of the refusal of the reichstag to honor Bismarck, we were offered the second vice-presidency. But we declined the questionable honor right in the initial stages of the proceedings. Today, the center party has become the ruling party, and does not pay any attention to parliamentary justice. They deny our claim for very specious reasons, even though they weaken the bourgeois parliament in so doing.

Nevertheless, we make our claim simply because we do not give up any right to which we are entitled. We do not expect to gain any advantages by this action. On the contrary: Careful observers of the tariff fight have long ago arrived at the conclusion that a Socialist vice-president would be rather harmful than otherwise to us in critical situations, and that it would be much better for us, if decent bourgeois representatives, who are mindful of their duties of president under all circumstances, were to hold that office. A few comrades who unfortunately are endowed with diplomatic gifts, think otherwise about those advantages. It may be admitted that this is a mistake, but it certainly is not

a crime, much less a reason for a great party action with all its concomitant "symptoms, principles, opportunisms and radicalism."

There is so little to be said about this very simple and quite unimportant question of the vice-presidency, that it is almost like a fairy tale that so much could have been said about it. And if a few party leaders have had some very wholesome tilts over this question, there is no reason for complaint. For really, the fate of the party does not depend so much on the opinions of the leaders, whose principal functions are those of counselors, educators, trustees, and experts. The hopes and the dangers are vested in the masses. As long as this bold, idealistic, far-seeing, and yet calm spirit lives in the Socialist Party, conceiving of the whole field of economics and politics as an inseparable unit, just so long will the party remain strong and invincible, and we need not fear the only real danger, viz., that the party might fall a victim to the disease of a short-sighted policy of special interests. Whether this or that leader speaks or writes one thing or another makes very little difference, compared to the great possibilities of our development. These fateful developments are not decided by literary notions. Everyone has simply to do his utmost toward a strong forward movement of the spirit of the masses, by which the intimate union between principle and practical politics was accomplished.

We should not have felt the desire to once more touch on these tactical discussions, which no one can compel us to regard as of any importance. We should count them among the customary summer discussions, that do no harm and serve no useful purpose. But the present political situation suggests to us the apprehension that an essential part of the Dresden convention might be wasted in useless internal discussions. That convention should be devoted entirely to matters of prime importance. It should sharpen the steel against all the enemies that surround us.

Never, perhaps, has the Socialist Party stood at the eve of such tremendous developments as those that confront us now. Let us not deceive ourselves. Our victory has made a deeper impression on the ruling classes and on the leading circles, than they show outwardly. There is something stewing and brewing. It is apparent that the center party intends to become the savior of the state. If the Prussian schools are delivered into the control of that party, then it is willing to lend its hand to any rascality of the government.

Under these conditions, the Socialist Party has no time to fritter away on such discussions as have been going on recently. We have only one duty: To reflect in what manner, under what forms, we can use our three million votes in the interest of the proletariat, of the German people, and of the future.

Translated by *Ernest Untermann*.

The Class Struggle in Great Britain.

THE world's great and ancient metropolis looks like the pictures one sees in books, from the first reader to the latest magazine, and so the weary pilgrim does not feel very strange after he lands. However, you at once miss that headlong rush and rattle-de-bang noise seen and heard in New York and Chicago. The Englishman don't seem to be in a very great hurry—even the stage-coach horses take their time as they plod along through the narrow streets.

In an American industrial center we find the working class hurrying to the shops and factories at seven in the morning. Here an hour later is considered early. The nine-hour day is pretty generally observed, and especially the Saturday half-holiday. The well-organized trades only work eight hours a day. Wages, of course, are not as high as in the United States. Neither are the living expenses. On the whole, the English workingman lives as well, but hardly any better, than the American toiler. Judging from appearances, the Britishers wear as good clothes, live in as good houses, eat as well and are as strong and healthy, and have as many sports and amusements as the so-called Yanks. All of which goes to prove that the socialist philosophy is correct—that the capitalists of any nation allow their workers only sufficient to keep body and soul together and to propagate another generation of toilers; that the workers are compelled to wage a class struggle to maintain what they have gained in the shape of higher wages and shorter hours, and that only in proportion as they become educated and fight for increased advantages do they secure better conditions.

Great Britain, as we in America have learned in a general way, is busily occupied in extending the functions of municipal governments—they call it municipal socialism. Even the most reactionary Tories do not seem to have the horror of the word socialism that is formed among some of the poorest workingmen in the States. In fact, many of the Tories seriously regard themselves as the guardians of the common people, and they take a sort of paternalistic interest in those who produce wealth for them. For the profits that are turned over to them they appear to feel that they have some obligations to meet.

Hence we find that in nearly all of the principal cities the street railway systems are owned and operated by the municipalities. They also furnish light and power and are pushing the experiment of razing the slums and erecting decent habitations, which are rented to the workers. Baths, wash houses, milk depots, markets, libraries, and many other useful institutions are being established, and while those popular or populist reforms do not affect the capitalistic system materially, yet unconsciously

the bourgeoisie is treading upon dangerous ground. Labor's appetite for this sort of thing is being sharpened, and, irrespective as to whether or not the taxes of the capitalists are being somewhat lowered, and whether exploitation is being shifted from individual employers to the municipality controlled by their politicians, the fact remains that these experiments are being carried on, and successfully, too; and as, stated above, the workers are becoming familiar with the former bugaboo of socialism, and there are plenty of signs that indicate that in a very short time labor will take control of these municipal works and conduct them in its own interests, paying no attention to the taxation detail.

This view of the situation is being taken by the leading trade unionists of the country. Upward of \$1,500,000,000 of property has been municipalized in Great Britain, and the work is going forward at an accelerated rate, and the unionists make no secret of their intentions of securing control of the powers of government for the purpose of conducting public affairs in the interest of the people who produce the wealth instead of a few property-owners, who are everlastingly growling about taxes.

Great progress has been made among the workers of this country toward entering the political field with a united front. The unions and socialist parties have formed an agreement to work together for the election of members to Parliament, there to compose a distinct labor group. At present there are fourteen labor men in Parliament, and it is expected that at the next general election, which is likely to be ordered soon, that number will be doubled at least. Over a million members of trade unions are now assessing themselves for the purpose of creating campaign funds, and every week adds to the number. They are really in earnest, judging from the statements of their officials and newspapers, and, as it is estimated that fully one-third of the workers in the trades are organized, it can be seen that labor is bound to play an important part in the next contest for seats in Parliament.

The causes that produced this unexpected activity are many. In the first place the workers of Great Britain, like those of every country, are becoming more highly educated. Then, again, there has been quite a long period of hard times over here, and the insecurity of work has made the laboring people quite discontented with the old political parties. The South African war has increased their burdens in certain directions, while the employers, besides introducing labor-saving machinery, are also inclined to force upon them new schemes to drive them to increased production. The fact that the government passed a bill that will extend a measure of home rule to Ireland, which will make it possible for the Irish peasant to own land in twenty-one years, while the British workers will remain at the mercy of their aristocratic landlords, is causing much discussion. But probably the

most important question that the unionists are discussing, and the one that has opened their eyes to the necessity of using their political power, is the Taff-Vale decision and the hostile acts that have resulted therefrom. It will be recalled that the railway workers were mulcted out of a sum of \$114,000 about a year ago, as damages for striking and picketing. This decision fell like a bomb in the camp of the trade unions. It opened the way for a general assault upon the treasuries of the organization, and the employers have not been slow to take advantage of the situation. At this writing there are two more cases being fought in the courts. The miners of South Wales had enforced a system of "stop days"; that is, they ceased work on certain days to prevent the accumulation of a great surplus of coal, reasoning that the operators would use such surplus to enforce a reduction of wages. The men argued that they were wholly within their rights, because the employers had the power to, and, indeed, did, close down when it suited them. But the masters objected to the men taking the initiative, and brought suit for damages. The bosses claim they have suffered losses amounting to no less than \$350,000 owing to the enforcement of the "stop day" system. The Court of Appeals has already decided in favor of the bosses, and the union carried the case to the House of Lords, the supreme court of the land. In view of the interpretation of law in the Taff-Vale case, there seems to be little hope for the miners, as the "law lords" are not likely to reverse themselves. I am informed that the cost of this case will amount to \$250,000, and if it goes against the Welsh miners it will bankrupt them. The Yorkshire mine owners have also filed suits against the men of Cadeby and Deneby, and they place their damages at no less than \$620,000, which, with the costs, will bring the sum at stake close to a million dollars.

It can be taken for granted that this condition has aroused organized labor of Great Britain as nothing else ever did. The men see their years of saving and self-denial dissipated at one fell swoop. For years, in sunshine and in storm, they have placed their dependence in their unions, and now to have their only prop knocked out from under them is a severe blow, indeed.

The employers of Great Britain are also combining quite rapidly, and some of their syndicates are being merged with American trusts, thus assuring them of the abolition of cut-throat competition. No doubt within a couple of years this country will be in control of trusts as absolutely as are the people of the United States.

All of these questions will come up for discussion at the British Trade Union Congress at Leicester next week, and the indications are that the organized workers will take a long step forward to secure their emancipation from the wage-slavery of modern capitalism.

Max S. Hayes.

Socialism in Japan.

IT IS NOW over two years since I wrote you about socialism in Japan. During those years Japanese socialists have had varied experiences, but on the whole we have gained a firmer ground for socialism than two years ago. Socialism in Japan is now a recognized social force, much hated and feared by capitalists and the capitalistic government. Nowadays socialists' speeches are always interfered with and stopped short. Their freedom is trampled down in gross violation of the laws and constitution. Our police authority and courts are all deadly against the socialists. The old time-worn press law is strictly enforced upon our publications. Within three months our organ, *The Socialist*, was condemned and two numbers confiscated and the editor fined. For what reasons? It only published a translation of a poem, "International Liberty," in the one and a short article on socialism in the other.

We started on a socialist agitation tour some seven weeks ago, during which we visited ten prefectures and fourteen cities and towns. We held nineteen meetings in these places, and over half of the speakers were either interfered with or stopped and could not complete their speeches. In some cities our meetings were stopped at the very beginning. In one instance before the meeting was begun the police stepped in and dispersed the peaceful citizens who were present at the place of meeting. They were driven out of the hall by force in a most barbarous manner, violating the personal liberty guaranteed by the constitution. We are utterly powerless under these injustices, for laws and courts are all against us. The administration court to which we can appeal in such a case of injustice will never give a verdict for us, but invariably sustains the official acts.

Just now I am with only two young men, Messrs. Nishikawa and Matsugaki, working for the cause of socialism by giving all our time and energy and money. It is a very feeble attempt for the cause of socialism, but so much is the all we can do. There are a few able writers and speakers among socialists, but it is a sad fact that they cannot give their best time and energy to this cause, for they are all engaged in some profession, generally journalism or education. We feel that we ought to be doing more, but we socialists are few and poor and cannot do much. This trip of ours gave a light on our future, for the authorities seem determined to crush socialism and stop its spread by police force and oppression. We will fight out our cause at any cost.

While the horizon of socialism seems so sad and gloomy, we are nevertheless increasing in number and power everywhere. We have gained many adherents in those cities in which we held our

socialist meetings. These timely sown seeds of socialism will grow on the fertile ground of oppression, degradation and corruption caused by the capitalistic injustices and cruelties.

We found everywhere evils of capitalism. In the Navy Yard at Kose men are compelled to work thirty-six hours in one stretch and sometimes two full days and nights, or forty-eight hours in one stretch. Among the collieries in Kinshiu there are men, women and children of all ages working twelve hours in a deep coal pit. These coal pits have a depth of 2,000 feet, are dirty and unhealthy, without any protection for limbs of miners. Sometimes a mother with a child of two or three months goes down the pit to help the husband miners by carrying coals. During these twelve hours the child is left in the dark wet hole to breathe foul air. It is said that out of 7,000 miners some 800 persons were killed last year in one colliery having seven pits or an average of two and one-half persons killed every day through the year. But none of these atrocious crimes committed by the colliery owner Mitsuit are condemned by the press or law.

Tokyo, Japan, August 24th, 1903.

S. J. Katayama.

The Referendum Movement and the Socialist Movement in America.

THE socialists of this country were the first to call public attention to the referendum. As early as 1889, the Socialist Labor party embodied in its national platform a referendum plank. It soon gained popularity with all reformers, and was in 1900 forced into the national platform of the Democratic party. Persistent agitation by the advocates of Direct Legislation has in many places compelled the Republican party as well to declare for the principle of the Referendum and the Initiative, so that at present the demand for it may be said to have spread beyond party lines. Singularly enough, the Socialists have scarcely taken part, as an organized body, in the agitation which owes to them its origin. This remark is not made in a spirit of fault-finding, for the writer is himself but a recent convert to the cause of Direct Legislation, and bears his individual share of responsibility for the lukewarmness of the Socialists towards this movement; he believes, however, that the facts which have convinced him may convince others that the Referendum and Initiative open to the Socialist parties a new and fruitful field for independent political action, without imperiling the integrity of the party or its uncompromising political attitude and without in any way interfering with other forms of political action.

Let us first see what has been accomplished by the movement for Direct Legislation. In South Dakota, the Legislature, a majority of whom were Populists, Silver Republicans and Democrats (fusionists), submitted, in 1897, to the voters of the state the question of adopting the Referendum and the Initiative. Most of the Republicans in the legislature voted in favor of the reform. At the next election, 1898, the voters adopted the system. In 1899, the Republican party, which then had a majority in each House, enacted a statute to put it into operation. The new act confers on the voters the veto power on any bill which has not received a two-thirds majority in the legislature. No such bill may become a law until the voters have had 90 days to examine it and, if found objectionable, to file a petition signed by five per cent of the voters and demanding that the bill be submitted to a referendum at the next election. The voters may likewise initiate legislation by filing a petition embodying a bill to be voted upon at the next election.

In Oregon, a constitutional amendment giving expression to the same principles was proposed in 1898, and adopted by a Republican legislature; under the Oregon constitution, an amendment must be passed by two successive legislatures and ratified by a popular vote. In 1900 all parties pledged their support to the

measure; the Republicans again had a majority in the legislature; the amendment passed the legislature and was submitted to the people, who in 1902 adopted it by a vote of 11 to 1. An act carrying this amendment into effect was passed by the legislature in February, 1903.

In Colorado a constitutional amendment was adopted at the November election of 1902, providing for the amendment of the municipal charter of Denver by the Initiative and Referendum. Five per cent of the voters of the city and county of Denver may initiate any municipal ordinance or charter amendment and the proposition must be submitted to a popular vote at the next general election.

In Los Angeles, at the municipal election held December 1, 1902, a Direct Legislation amendment to the city charter was adopted by a vote of 12,846 to 1,942 (6 to 1). The amendment was ratified by the legislature on January 25, 1903. The amendment enables five per cent of the voters to initiate city ordinances at every regular municipal election.

In many other states the enactment of similar laws cannot be delayed very long. In Utah the Referendum and the Initiative have become a part of the constitution, but the constitution has been nullified by the legislature, which has so far refused to enact a statute to carry the principle into operation. Still such an anomalous condition cannot continue forever.

In Illinois the legislature in 1901 enacted a law for the submission of questions of public policy to a popular vote upon the petition of 10 per cent of the voters in the state, or 25 per cent in a municipality. Under that law a referendum was taken in the next spring municipal election (1902) in Chicago, upon the question of public ownership of street railways and lighting plants and resulted in a large majority for that principle. At the fall election of 1902 Direct Legislation agitators secured more than the requisite number of signatures to a "proposal question of public policy" in favor of a constitutional amendment embodying the Referendum and Initiative. The proposal was submitted to the voters of the state and received 428,000 affirmative votes against 87,000 in the negative. As this expression of popular opinion is as yet not mandatory upon the legislature, a bill in favor of a Direct Legislation amendment to the constitution was voted down at the last session of the legislature. Yet, in this country public opinion is the court of last resort, and there is little room for doubt that ultimately the Solons at Springfield will have to yield to the popular will.

In Missouri an amendment to the constitution was adopted March 11, 1903, which provides for the Initiative and Referendum upon a petition signed by from 10 to 20 per cent of the voters of each congressional district. The amendment is to be voted upon in the November election of next year. The per-

centage is unreasonably high and the law is so framed as to make it inoperative; yet in Chicago the requisite number of signers to the municipal ownership petition was as high as 25 per cent of all voters, and yet the requisite number of signatures was secured.

In Nevada, a Direct Legislation amendment passed the legislature March 12, 1903, and now awaits the vote of the people at the coming election. In Massachusetts a Direct Legislation bill was passed by the House of Representatives on May 5, 1903. In Idaho and Washington similar amendments received a majority in the legislature, but the vote in each case was short of the two-thirds required by the constitution; it is now only a question of winning over a few votes, and continued public agitation will ultimately accomplish that result.

On the whole, the results are encouraging, especially because they have been accomplished without lobbying, but by the pressure of public opinion. The persistent agitation of labor organizations and other non-political bodies forced the politicians to action, for fear lest the other party might gain votes by the advocacy of the popular demand.

With every Socialist party worker the question will arise, What particular benefit will accrue to the Socialist party from the Referendum and Initiative, that it should expend its energy in agitating for a reform which is likely to come through the efforts of others? In an article addressed to Socialist readers it would be a waste of time to dilate upon the justice of the principle itself, for it has been for a long time in practical operation in party affairs; the question need here only be treated upon the ground of expediency.

Up to this day political action by Socialist parties in this country has been confined to nominating candidates and electioneering; in but a few cases this agitation resulted in the election of Socialist candidates. Surely, if immediate success at the polls were the sole object of the Socialist parties, as it is with other parties, the results would not justify the energy expended. Socialist nominations are made because, it is thought, first, that they offer an opportunity for Socialist agitation, and second, that they enable us to gauge the Socialist sentiment abroad in the country. It is also believed that the gradual growth of the vote from one election to another advances the day of ultimate Socialist victory at the polls.

For any one of these purposes the Referendum and Initiative offer invaluable opportunities to the Socialist party.

The platform of the Socialist (formerly Social-Democratic) party consists of a declaration of general principles and a number of "immediate demands," whose enactment into law is urged pending the final triumph of the Socialist party. A great deal of opposition has been developed within the party to these "imme-

mediate demands." It is argued that the Socialist party upon gaining control of the political machinery, will be in a position to carry out the full programme of Socialism, so these "immediate demands" would be superfluous; prior to that day, however, these demands could not be enacted in any other way except by a non-Socialistic party, which is considered undesirable.

These objections are removed by the Initiative and Referendum. In South Dakota the Socialist party is today in a position to formulate all its "immediate demands" into bills, circulate petitions in support of them, and if 5 per cent of the voters are thus enlisted the bills must be submitted to the vote of the people of the state of South Dakota. In this manner any of these demands could be enacted into law over the heads of old-party politicians, full credit accruing to the Socialist party initiating the desired legislation.

In Los Angeles the Socialist party need no longer wait for the election of its candidates on the city ticket, in order to make its voice heard in municipal affairs. There were about 30,000 votes cast in Los Angeles at the last election; 1,500 signatures are sufficient to initiate municipal legislation. The vote for Debs in 1900 was 995; thus it is easily seen that the Socialist party would have no difficulty in securing a sufficient number of signatures to a bill embodying into law any of the propositions of the Socialist municipal platform.

The same is true of Denver, where there are about 40,000 voters; the requisite 2,000 signatures to an Initiative proposition for a municipal ordinance or charter amendment could be secured among the Socialist voters themselves.

In Illinois where the law authorizes the submission of broad questions of public policy to a popular vote, the Socialists might, if they thought it expedient, submit today the question, Shall all means of production and distribution be owned and operated by the people? Or they might embody the same principle in a number of concrete propositions relating, e. g., to the stockyards, the packing houses, the coal mines, etc., and thus gradually educate the public mind in the principles of Socialism.

That this must prove a powerful means of Socialist agitation is undeniable. The ante-election agitation continues at best for one or two months, whereas the circulation of petitions will require active work all year around. More than that, it will make every Socialist from a mere sympathizer an active agitator. The Socialist vote at the last election stood about 280,000, whereas the aggregate membership of both Socialist parties hardly reached 20,000. That leaves 260,000 men who express their belief in Socialism by casting a Socialist vote once in 365 days. If it became necessary, however, to collect a vast number of signatures to a Socialistic petition, each one of them would be constituted a committee of one to circulate it among his friends

and neighbors; questions would be asked, and every Socialist, who may not have the abilities of a public speaker, would have the opportunity of presenting the principles of Socialism in an informal talk to his acquaintances. A vast number of people could be approached in that way, who are not reached by Socialist meetings or by the Socialist press. The benefits of such an educational campaign cannot be overestimated. If the Socialist party should meet with sufficient support to have any of its propositions submitted to a Referendum, it would bring the principles of Socialism directly before the whole people, something which cannot be accomplished by any other available method of political agitation.

Let us next consider the second argument in favor of campaigning, viz., that it serves as an index of the strength of Socialism. While it is so as far as it goes, it does not go far enough. It has not been possible to muster the full strength of Socialism in any election. It is a well known fact that the head of the Socialist ticket, as a rule, falls behind his running mates. Should the number of straight votes alone cast for the full Socialist ticket be considered as the truly Socialist vote, which means the lowest vote cast for any candidate on the ticket, even then it is a fact that the number of such votes is liable to decline at a presidential or gubernatorial, or mayoralty election; numerous examples could be cited to prove it. Should these fluctuations of the Socialist vote be interpreted as reflecting temporary changes in the Socialist sentiment? Not at all. It merely shows that even among those voters who identify themselves with Socialism as far as voting the Socialist ticket, there are some who still take an interest in the political issues or candidates brought forward by other parties. There are many more who profess to be Socialists, yet for one reason or another do not vote the Socialist ticket at all. In 1896 some people considering themselves Socialists were so impressed with the impending danger to the interests of the working class from the free coinage of silver, that they cast their votes for McKinley. In 1900 the issue of Imperialism gave many votes to Bryan which might otherwise have gone to Debs.

In European countries the system of reballoting enables the Socialist voter to cast his first vote for the Socialist candidates and the second for one of the two candidates who have a chance of election; thus his first vote is a vote for his principles and his second vote a vote upon the issues of the day. In this country there is but one chance to vote, and it is the vote for Socialist principles that suffers by it. And what is more serious, under our system of elections, the further progress of Socialist agitation and spread of Socialist sentiment are apt to accrue to the benefit of scheming politicians. The declarations of the New York State convention of the Democratic party in favor of nationalization of the anthracite coal mines was avowedly a bid for the Socialist

or radical vote. The election returns seem to indicate that the Hill plank accomplished its purpose with many voters, who might otherwise have swelled the Socialist column.

The marked feature of the election of 1902 was the growth of the Socialist vote, which more than doubled in the United States since the last presidential election. In New York, however, which is the veteran state of Socialist agitation and could in all previous elections boast of a larger Socialist vote than any other state, the vote for the Social Democratic party increased only by 82 per cent as against 132 per cent throughout the United States, the vote for the S. L. P. increased only by 25 per cent as against 59 per cent throughout the United States, and the aggregate vote for both Socialist parties increased only by 54 per cent as against 113 per cent throughout the United States.

The election returns for the state of New York show that the total gubernatorial vote in 1902 fell 10 per cent short of the popular vote for president in 1900; the Socialist parties were the only ones that showed actual gains. If, however, Greater New York is segregated from the rest of the state, we observe that the Democratic candidate for governor in 1902 gained 11,000 votes as compared with the gubernatorial candidate in 1900, whereas Governor Odell lost 68,000 votes. As the percentage of stay-at-homes in Greater New York is shown by the election returns to have been the same as up-state, and there is no reason why in New York City there should have been a greater percentage of stay-at-homes among the Republicans than among the Democrats, it is reasonable to assume that there must have been large defections from the Republican to the Democratic camp beside the actual increase of 11,000 votes. Now the Democrats whom the silver agitation had driven into the Republican ranks in 1896, returned into the fold in 1900, when McKinley gained only 2,000 votes as against 127,000 gained by Bryan. The Democratic gains in 1902 must therefore have come from other sources; this may account for the comparatively low increase of the Socialist vote in New York. Many a voter who is in sympathy with the Socialist movement, must have reasoned that the Socialist party could not win, while the Democratic could; thus a vote for the Democratic party appeared to him under the circumstances as a vote for the nationalization of the anthracite coal mines.

The Initiative and Referendum will serve in this country the same end as the system of reballoting in Europe. It will enable every voter to vote for his principles, even though he may be anxious to vote for the "winning man." Moreover, it will effectively protect the Socialist party from any attempt of the old parties to "steal its thunder," for it will always be the Socialist party who will first initiate all Socialistic bills. Thus it is only the Initiative and Referendum that can bring out the full strength

of the Socialist sentiment and record it to the credit of the Socialist party.

This leads us to the third proposition, viz., that the growth of the Socialist party vote speeds on the ultimate victory of the Socialist party. It is obvious that the rate of progress in this respect is dependent upon the strength of the Socialist sentiment in the nation; anything that gives additional force to the Socialist movement is bound to result in an increased vote for the Socialist party. Therefore, the agitation for Socialism through the Initiative and Referendum must hasten the victory of the Socialist party. Moreover, when it becomes possible for the voters to enact laws and frame policies independently of Congress and legislatures, the argument in favor of voting for the "winning candidate," "the best man," or "the lesser of two evils," must be considerably weakened. Suppose, every opponent of Imperialism had the opportunity to vote directly for the Initiative bill, "Be it enacted by the people of the United States, that the President of the United States be and he is hereby instructed forthwith to withdraw all military forces from the Philippines and to relinquish the Philippine Islands to an independent government to be freely elected by the sovereign people of the Philippine Islands"—what justification would there have been for any believer in Socialist principles to vote for Bryan, as a rebuke to Imperialism? A vote for Anti-Imperialism could then have been combined with a vote for Debs. This would have added to the Socialist column many a vote from among those who were not convinced by the Socialist argument that the issue of Imperialism or anti-Imperialism did not concern the working class.

There is still more to be said. Today the Socialist has very little to say in the current affairs of the day. If there is a piece of vicious legislation pending, he can merely denounce it in mass-meetings or in his own press. With the Optional Referendum as in South Dakota, or Los Angeles, the Socialist party would constitute itself a permanent vigilance committee that would promptly call a popular veto on every bill which is hostile to the interests of the working class. This would infuse new vigor into the Socialist party and bring it into closer touch with the people in their work-a-day interests.

Nor would it in any way conflict with the uncompromising attitude of the Socialist party towards other political parties. The agitation for the Referendum and the Initiative need not involve the Socialist party into alliances of any sort with any other political party; the Socialist party has its own natural sphere of influence in the trade unions, which have in the past been the most active element in the campaign for Direct Legislation.

It was natural for Massachusetts to take the lead. A petition in favor of the Referendum endorsed by 570 trade unions of the

state and bearing the signatures of more than 50,000 voters was presented to the General Court by the Socialist Representative James Carey; the effect of this agitation can be gauged by the vote in the House on the Direct Legislation bill, which was 155 for and only 22 against the bill. In Massachusetts, as elsewhere, the politicians have their ears close to the ground.

In closing the writer wishes to be understood that it is not his intention to recommend the Referendum and the Initiative as a substitute for the present form of political agitation, but as an additional weapon in the fight for Socialism.

Marxist.

Italian Socialist Convention.

THE first annual Convention of the "Federazione Socialista Italiana" took place on September 6-7, in West Hoboken, N. J. There were 33 delegates present, representing some 30 Locals and eight different states.

The convention was opened amid great enthusiasm by G. M. Serrati, editor of "Il Proletario"—the Italian Socialist daily—who called the delegates to order and made some appropriate introductory remarks. It was voted by acclamation to send a congratulatory cablegram to Comrade Enrico Ferri in Rome, for his noble fight against the "grafters" in the Navy department. This also meant that the convention was with him, and stood for an uncompromising political attitude.

Aside from the minor work of the Federation's affairs, the most important questions for the Convention to discuss were the following:

First—The Party Press.

Second—The Co-operative Stores Movement.

Third—Establishment of an Immigration Bureau.

Fourth—Attitude of the Federation towards the trades unions.

Fifth—Attitude of the Federation towards the two Socialist Parties, the S. L. P. and the S. P.

Only one out of the thirty-three delegates is in favor of discontinuing the publication of the daily paper. Thirty-two delegates want the paper to be continued at all costs, even to the extent of having each Local pledge a monthly contribution to defray the expenses of publication. A true spirit of Socialism and of noble self-denial was shown by the delegates during this discussion, in which the comrades stated their willingness to share their scanty wages for the enlightenment of their fellow-men.

An able report was submitted by G. Lavagnini of Northfield, Vt., on the establishment of Co-operative stores, demonstrating their efficiency as an auxiliary to the Socialist movement, and showing their successful operation amongst the Italian Socialists of Vermont.

It was the sense of the convention that the comrades should encourage and work for such movements in all places where local conditions were favorable, especially in small cities, where large department stores did not exist.

The advisability of establishing an Immigration Bureau was then discussed, and the advantages that might accrue to the immigrant were plainly stated. The padrone, the banker and many other colonial sharks, made an easy prey of the poor and simple Italians migrating to these shores, defrauding them and selling them like chattels to the contractors. The Bureau would protect

them, assist them and put them on their guard. It was voted that it should be left to the Executive Committee to take the preliminary steps for the establishment of such a bureau.

It being impossible to discuss the trades unions without involving party tactics, a discussion on the same was then started.

As might be supposed, this brought about a warm debate, and it seemed for a time that the S. L. P. comrades were going to sway the Convention. A report was submitted by Dellavia, full of the false and time worn out vilifications against the Socialist party, and, in order to prejudice the delegates against our party, the same report had been printed and distributed some time before the Convention. Comrade G. M. Serrati, however, replied to the false accusation, and showed that while it might be true that in some instances the Socialist Party had been slack and of a too broad spirit, the majority of its members were good uncompromising Socialists, doing excellent work in all states of the Union, in many of which the S. L. P. did not exist at all. "In the S. L. P. press," he said, "I see nothing but insults against other Socialists; in the S. P. press I see nothing but Socialism. I am in favor of a union between the two parties, but cannot countenance the conduct of the S. L. P." He then read a communication of the International Socialist Bureau, informing him that the only Socialist Party recognized there at present was the Socialist Party.

Comrades Ecaterinara of Newark, N. J., and G. Lavagnini of Vermont also spoke in favor of the S. P., stating that it was the only party working for Socialism in their respective localities.

A number of resolutions were introduced, and one of Com. Serrati, to the effect that, *While the Federation was on general principles, with the S. L. P., it was optional for comrades in places where there was no S. L. P., to vote for the uncompromising candidates of the other Socialist Party.*

An official delegate from the S. L. P. was then given the floor to make his *pronunciamento* on the resolution. He said he was not in favor of it. If the Italian Socialists favored the S. L. P., they must either be entirely with the S. L. P. or against it. His Party would not stand for any half-way policy. He hoped the Italian comrades would open their eyes.

The answer of the Convention to this complimentary remark, was another resolution:

To sever all connections and alliances with the S. L. P., and constitute themselves into an independent organization, which was then put to vote and carried, 19 for, and 15 against.

The Trades-Unions question then naturally resolved itself, and the Convention voted to follow the tactics as laid down at the International Congress, which are those of the Socialist Party.

Several minor matters were then transacted: the election of a new Executive Committee, and the appointment of Local New-

ark to receive all complaints. The issuing of two dollar shares, to cover a mortgage on the Socialist Block of Barre, Vt., was authorized. The resignation of G. M. Serrati as editor of *Il Proletario* was unwillingly received. The Convention adjourned at 8:45 p. m. with three cheers for International Socialism.

While the constitution of the Federation did not allow the delegates of the Socialist Party to be officially recognized, comrades Solomon, De Luca and the writer were present and made many friends amongst the delegates, eventually furnishing them with useful information which had a decided bearing on their most important vote.

On the whole, the Convention was a credit to the Italian comrades. Party and personal feelings were all made subordinate to the Socialist movement. A sincere and intense desire to promote the cause of Socialism dominated all their actions, and when the vote to break away from DeLeon was announced, a voice was heard to say: "There are neither victors nor vanquished here, we are all comrades!"

Springfield, Mass.

Silvio Origo.

Wanted—A Constitution.

ABOUT 25 years ago Governor Plaisted, of Maine, said in an address: "Thirty years ago in our country, a pauper was as scarce as a prince, and so was a millionaire. Now we have thousands of millionaires and they own, as their private property, much more than is owned by all the rest of the people. The time is rapidly approaching when—unless there is an economic revolution—the only people in these states will be millionaires, their hirelings, and paupers."

It is certain, however, that the economic revolution will take place. Hitherto, the "middle classes" have been our most active opponents, but the syndicates will drive most of them into our ranks. One after another each business will be syndicated—grocery, dry-goods, clothing, furniture, hardware, baking, building, bookselling, printing; all manufacturing, fishing and mining; the farmer will have to sell his produce to the syndicates, and even the doctors and lawyers will be unable to compete successfully with the syndicate agents.

State and national collectivism will certainly be forced upon us by the syndicate collectivism. Ten thousand millionaires cannot subjugate all the rest of the people—who will not long endure a government by millionaires for the benefit of millionaires.

In preparation for "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people," we ought to be learning how to govern, so that, when the time comes, we may begin without confusion and serious blundering.

When a captain asks people to accompany him on a voyage, he not only tells them what port he is bound for, but tells them which way he is going, and at what ports he will call by the way, and he has a well-defined chart of his course. It is time for us to have our chart—our Constitution of the Commonwealth. (Nearly thirty years ago, I drafted the form of such a Constitution—a form that might now be of some use as an aid in the framing of a less imperfect one.)

We have some very good general maxims for our guidance: "No rights without duties; no duties without rights," From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." To those I would add, No authority without responsibility, no responsibility without authority. No money to waste time over. And I would add Kipling's great lines: "None shall work for money and none shall work for fame, but all for the joy of the working."

The systems known as the Referendum, the Initiative, and the Imperative Mandate are essential for true republicanism. The people's organizations are, to some extent, already using them.

But we have yet to decide how, in the Socialist future, we shall govern each separate trade and locality; whether the State or Nation shall have control of the railroads, etc., the authority of the State over children, and many other problems.

For the satisfaction of the many thousands of people who are inclined towards Socialism, we should, as soon as possible, formulate our proposed Constitution. If honestly and wisely formulated, it will cause a few people to leave our ranks, but for each one that leaves a score will rally under our banner.

Lunenburg, Mass.

Wm. Harrison Riley.

To Socialism.

REVILED defender and upholder of the rights of Man;
Unflinching asserter of the Brotherhood of Man;
Unflinching facer of those future years so filled with
frowns of free-born men, no longer free who love
thee not—

Endue me with thy poise.

Provider of perpetual peace that stills pale, haggard Competition's call to war,

Sole selfless Savior of the race from all-enslaving Greed;
Unconscious Christian crying Christ's commands aloud, still nailed
upon the cross as He—

Endue me with thy peace.

Impartial pupil of imperial *Right* that places plenty in the hands
of each and all;

Stern slayer of the sullen soul will not surrender stolen, selfish
joys;

All-patient lover of the poor, still paid with penal name by por-
tionless participants of pauper's lot and fare—

Grant me to love as thou.

Forecaster of a future filled with faithful work performed with
joy by all;

Denouncer of these dotage-days that doom and damn both rich and
poor;

Courageous, calm Compatriot calling "Come" to rich and poor
alike—

Grant me to echo "Come."

Aspiring, some would strike all chains from willing and unwill-
ing slaves.

Aspiring to thy poise, thy peace, thy love unbounded free and all
despite of hate, thy call—to even echo it—one heard thee
say,

"Let be!

I am the solvent sets all free,
Bring them to me."

Aspiring sends this song from one whose bondage was dissolved
by thy embrace, in gratitude this day.

O Thou incessant and unstinting Sower of the life-bought seed
with wide-flung hand in ev'ry clime,

God speed, God speed, and SPEED.

—Edwin Arnold Brenholts.

The Legal Fiction of Equality.

"There are no classes in America. I hate the name!" Judge George Gray, quoted in the "Outlook" of July 4, 1903.

IN order to a true understanding of that much misunderstood assertion of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are born free and equal, the economic significance of the American Revolution must be borne in mind. The chain of revolutions, of which that in America formed a highly characteristic link, whereby the bourgeoisie broke the power of the noblesse, was everywhere marked by an insistence on the worth and sacred liberty of the individual, untrammelled by any advantage arising to others from birth into a heritage of descendable class privilege. As hereditary privilege was the essence of the aristocratic status, its denial by the militant bourgeoisie was a matter of course. This, then, is all that was meant by the assertion of freedom and equality, namely, the repudiation of the legally recognized prestige of birth; and it would have saved much misconception if the principle had been expressed in negative form.

There is something very attractive, even to us moderns, in the aspect of the young, idealistic, revolutionary bourgeoisie, flushed with its victory over ancient and hallowed wrong, declaring that all men are *born* (note the word) equal, and proceeding to embody this rejection of inheritable ascendancy in its constitutions, customs and laws. But from this to the doctrine that all men shall remain forever after birth equal before the law, is evidently a step in advance; yet one which, in the then condition of American society, seemed but the necessary corollary of the first, or, perhaps, but another phase of the principle itself. For at that time, if we exclude the professional class which has never been inspired by a distinct economic interest, and the slaves who were not recognized as human, but one class existed in America—the middle class. Modern manufacture, with its splitting of the middle class into capitalists and wage-workers, was as yet unknown. The business of the country was agriculture; and the effect of unoccupied land in preventing the formation of a distinct class of wage laborers has already been pointed out in this magazine.* No injustice, therefore, resulted from the extension of the principle so as to exclude from legal cognizance not only the accident of birth, but all the accidents and vicissitudes of life as well.

How the principle, as thus broadened, has been preserved and consecrated in our jurisprudence, with the hearty approval of

*"The Economic Organization of Society," INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for July 1, 1903, p. 12.

bourgeois sentiment, through the application of the maxim *stare decisis*, or how necessary to an orderly system of laws conformity to precedent is, it is not the present purpose to discuss. It is enough that at the present day, while at least four major classes (speaking from an economic standpoint) appear in American society, with the germs and buddings of still further divisions, the courts still uniformly refuse, in deference to this legal fiction of equality, to see the facts before their eyes.

A distinction of class differs from that of caste in that the latter is hereditary and can never be escaped by the individual, while the former depends upon any incident or feature common to a group, which may be very transitory, so that the membership of a class may shift continuously. The basis of economic class distinction is the manner of securing a livelihood. Of the four classes referred to, naming them in the order of their prestige and political importance, the capitalists derive their living, without labor, from the three sources of rent, interest and profit, the latter usually assuming the concrete form of dividends. In practice, however, many capitalists still perform certain labor of oversight and direction in their businesses, thus occupying a position midway between the capitalistic and middle classes. The professional class differs from the capitalistic in that its income is derived from actual labor, while it differs from the wage-workers both in the quality of its services, its scale of living, which approximates the capitalistic, and in having for its employer the public at large. The middle class covers those whose living is derived from labor for the public performed with their own capital, and includes farmers owning and working their own farms, small storekeepers, the cross-roads blacksmith who owns his own shop, etc., etc., This class is oldest of all except the professional, and furnishes, in our modern life, constant accessions to all the others, becoming, through this depletion, a disappearing class. Remembering the days of its past glory, it is politically reactionary, and the political interests of the smaller capitalists sometimes lead to their affiliation with it. Lastly come the wage-workers, laborers working with the capital of others, the subjects of capitalistic exploitation, it being their unremunerated toil which enables the capitalists to live without toil. It is a peculiar characteristic of this class, and one which the reader is asked to treasure in mind during the remainder of this article, that it lives from hand to mouth, the wage of one day barely sufficing for the necessities of the next as determined by its scale of living, so that any cessation of employment spells deprivation of the means of life. Nor are the members of this class enabled to practice to any considerable extent the bourgeois virtue of saving, and even where they have done so, their scanty hordes are quickly exhausted when drawn on for subsistence. Continuous employment, therefore, becomes for them the *sine*

qua non of continued existence, and this sinister dependence constitutes the fetters of that status frequently referred to as wage slavery.

Evidently it must be pleasing to capitalists, in their legal conflicts with members of other classes, to have any class advantage accruing to them ignored by the courts, and that there is such advantage will be readily conceded by those of their opponents who have felt the embarrassment of the unequal contest. It is in suits between capitalists and wage earners, however, that the discrepancy in position is most manifest. The employee comes into legal conflict with the employer chiefly, if not almost wholly, in two varieties of actions—those for personal injuries, and strike litigation. As to the latter, the law involved is still in too nebulous a state to permit of instructive generalization. It is in actions brought by the employee for personal injuries occasioned by the employers' negligence, the law of which has been developed contemporaneously with the capitalistic system itself, that we may particularly note the malign influence of the legal fiction of equality. When the wage-worker is maimed or killed through his master's negligence, and his labor power thus impaired or cut off altogether, with a corresponding reduction in or termination of ability to earn a livelihood, his claim, or that of his family, against his master for reimbursement, might seem to the uninitiated layman peculiarly meritorious. It shall be our business to notice some of the judge-made rules of law indicative of the attitude of the courts thereto. And first, as to the measure of care required of the master.

In his work on *Master's Liability*, Mr. Bailey, after summarizing the duties of the master as those of furnishing reasonably safe appliances, a reasonably safe place to work, and the employment of a sufficient number of competent associates, adds (p. 3), "In the performance of these duties, the master is bound to the exercise of reasonable and ordinary care, and such only." Later he quotes (p. 24) with approval from the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania: "Absolute safety is unattainable, and employers are not insurers. They are liable for the consequences, not of danger, but of negligence; and the unbending test of negligence in methods, machinery and appliances is the ordinary usage of the business."

Passing by the principle, which is itself a luminous comment on the spirit of capitalism, that human life and limb are the subjects of only ordinary care, let us scrutinize the "unbending test" of that care, "the ordinary usage of the business." There is no question of the rule. It has been iterated and reiterated until a criticism of it seems almost pathetic in its futility. And yet whose province is it to fix "the ordinary usage of the business"? That of the employers. Any attempt of the workers to do so is

**Titus v. Railroad Co.*, 136 Pa. 618; 20 Atl. 517.

quickly resented as an unwarranted impertinence. The master erects his factory with a minimum allotment of space, air and light. He places cogs and belts and rollers where he will, and the workers are then invited to enter. Now, the only possible justification for this "unbending test" of negligence, is that they may refuse to do so. In other words, that the wage-earners may reject undesirable or hazardous employment, thus forcing a voice in the establishment of "the ordinary usage of the business." But as we have seen this is precisely what they cannot do. Enter they must, constrained by the imperious necessity which binds them in their status. Only when some single employer has exceeded the average disregard of human safety, may some of the more temerous refuse to work for him.

Thus the employers as a class establish the customary conditions of employment, sanctify by usage its dangers and discomforts and so fix the standards of their own liability. They are made judges of their own cause; and what any particular employer is held for, is not negligence, but *more than average* negligence. Then too, as the employer has no property interest in the bodies of his employees, unless he is actuated by motives of humanity or unless better conditions or safer appliances will also increase the output, there is no incentive for improvement. A need do no more than B, nor B than A. Old abuses of employment may continue eternally, carefully safeguarded by this rule of law. By this rule the courts have resigned their function of arbitrators between the parties, and contentedly accept the measure of responsibility prearranged by the defendant himself. That this is the practical effect of the rule is evidenced by the legislative effort to supply, as by factory and mine inspection laws, an impartial tribunal; or, as in the case of the act of Congress requiring safety brakes on cars used in interstate traffic, a measure of reliability in the law itself. It is, however, due to the United States Supreme Court to say that, latterly, some doubt as to the justice of the rule seems to have occurred to that eminent tribunal. It says:* "Ordinary care on the part of a railroad company implies, as between it and its employees, not simply that degree of diligence which is customary among those intrusted with the management of railroad property, but such as, having respect to the exigencies of the particular service, ought reasonably to be observed. It is such care as, in view of the consequences that may result from negligence on the part of the employer, is fairly commensurated with the perils and dangers likely to be encountered." But Mr. Bailey believes (p. 11) that the court afterwards receded from this, one would think fairly tenable, position.

But when even by these low standards, the master's negligence in a given instance has been proven, the injured servant's case

*Wabash Ry. Co. v. McDaniels, 107, U. S. 454; 2 Sup. Ct. 932.

is by no means won. Defenses peculiar to this class of actions still remain open to the former, among the most favorite being the doctrine of "assumed risk." Mr. Bailey's explanation of this doctrine (*Master's Liability*, p. 145) is so naive an expression of capitalistic sentiment, as to merit quotation at length:

"It is to be observed that persons and companies, and especially corporations, whose interests are large and business complex in character, and who necessarily have to intrust the management and performance of their business to officers, agents, and servants, do not always adopt such a method of conducting their business as to meet the requirements of duty as measured by the standard herein before stated and discussed. There are many classes of business, such as the operation of large factories and the management and operation of railroads, which are attended with great risks and perils, and the utmost, or even ordinary prudence, is not exercised; either in the manner of constructing their structures, providing machinery and appliances, or in their operation. If the strict rule of duty in these respects was always required, then it would be that many, if not most, of the enterprises of such character, which add so much to the convenience and material prosperity of the people, would have to be abandoned. Therefore it has come to be well settled that the master may conduct his business in his own way, although another method might be less hazardous; and the servant takes the risk of the more hazardous method, as well, if he knows the danger attending the business in the manner in which it is carried on. Hence, if the servant knowing the hazards of his employment as the business is conducted, is injured while employed in such business, he cannot maintain an action against the employer because he may be able to show there was a safer mode in which the business might have been carried on, and that, had it been conducted in that manner, he would not have been injured. Therefore the liability of a master to respond to his servant in damages for an injury received in the scope of his employment does not necessarily follow upon proof made that such injury was the result of the failure of the master to fully observe his duty as such, when measured by the standard of duty required, and governed by the principles stated in the preceding chapters, for the very plain reason that he may not owe his servant such duty or to such a degree. Such standard is that which is required and must be observed where the servant has no knowledge, actual or presumed, of the master's peculiar method of business, the situation of his premises, the character of his machinery," etc., etc.

Later Mr. Bailey (p. 170) thus formulates the rule: "The servant assumes the hazard of dangerous methods, as well as the use of defective tools or machinery, when, after employment, he learns of the defects, but voluntarily continues in the employment

**American Rolling Mill Co. v. Hullinger*, 67 N. E. 986.

without objection." The Supreme Court of Indiana, in a very late case* in which it frustrated, by reasoning unique in judicial annals, a bungling legislative attempt to get rid of the doctrine, thus carefully defines it: "Notwithstanding the duties the master owes the servant * * * , yet, if it appears that the latter had assumed the risk, there is no liability for negligence. This is but an application of the maxim '*Volenti non fit injuria*' (One who consents cannot be injured) which states a principle of very broad application in the law. The master may not have performed the duty required of him, but if the servant knows that such duty has not been performed, and appreciates the extent of the risk he thereby runs, or should have known and appreciated the same, he ordinarily assumes the risk, and this absolves the master from liability for his resulting injury."

That the servant is himself duly careful, that he has justifiably forgotten the defect or danger, that he is threatened with discharge if he does not accept the hazard prepared for him, have alike been held not to relieve him from assuming the risk of his master's admitted negligence. If he calls the master's attention to the defect or danger, and *secures a promise to repair or obviate it at a definite time*, this promise may, if he continues at work in reliance thereon, relieve him from assuming the risk, provided the danger is not too great, until it becomes apparent that the master does not intend to fulfill the promise, when the risk is again assumed.

In all the cases where the doctrine of assumed risk is applied, it is frankly and explicitly placed on the ground that the wage worker is the equal in all respects of the capitalist, that he occupies an equally advantageous position and enjoys the same independence of action, that he is at liberty to contract for such employment as he pleases, and to abandon it at will. Hence is exacted the price of this flattering liberty, that by accepting any given employment he assumes all dangers his master has culpably placed in his pathway, of which he knows or should know; and if the danger arises after employment, his continuance therein is visited by the same consequence. That all this is in full accord with the legal fiction of equality, and is likewise at profoundest variance with the facts, needs no argument to show. The judges who thus lightly remit the wage earner to a forfeiture of his employment, with the alternative of inability to recover for injuries incurred therein, have, as members of a different economic class, never known the worry of a "lost job," the bitter anxiety of being "out of work," or the humiliation of looking for employment. Judicial obliviousness to the shackles of economic necessity binding the laborer to his task, here works, probably, the cruelest injustice ever perpetrated by the courts upon the helpless in the name of liberty.

Another defense, of peculiar inequality, made in this class of actions is known as the "fellow servant doctrine."

It is a principle so old that its origin is lost in the mists of antiquity, that the master is responsible for an injury caused by the negligence of the servant while acting within the scope of his employment. This principle, known as the doctrine of *respondeat superior*, had an unquestioned place and uniform application both in English and American law till 1837, when the case of *Priestly v. Fowler* (3 Mees. & W. 1) was decided in England. In that case a servant sued his master for a broken thigh caused by the overloading and breaking of the master's van. The court in refusing him relief, said: "If the master be held liable to the servant in this action, the principle of that liability will be found to carry us to an alarming extent. * * * If the owner of the carriage is responsible for the sufficiency of his carriage to his servant, he is responsible for the negligence of his coachmaker, or his harness-maker, or his coachman. * * * The master, for example, would be liable to the servant for the negligence of the chambermaid, for putting him into a damp bed; for that of the upholsterer for sending in a crazy bedstead, whereby he was made to fall down while asleep and injure himself; for the negligence of the cook in not properly cleaning the copper vessels used in the kitchen; of the butcher in supplying the family with meat of a quality injurious to health; of the builder for a defect in the foundation of the house, whereby it fell and injured both the master and the servant by the ruins. The inconvenience, not to say the absurdity, of these consequences, afford a sufficient argument against the application of this principle (the doctrine of *respondeat superior*) to the present case." Thus an immemorial principle, so far as it would have protected the wage-earner, was disposed of by ridicule rather than argument, and that ridicule not only of a poor quality, but showing a very stupid failure to distinguish between a fellow servant and one from whom the master purchased goods.

Four years later, the Court of Errors of South Carolina* reached the same conclusion, basing it upon a wholly fanciful and fictitious "joint undertaking" by all the servants to work for their master.

A year later the Supreme Court of Massachusetts† announced the fellow servant rule, placing it squarely on the basis of assumed risk, and in 1850, the English courts‡ did the same, saying, "The principle is, that a servant when he engages to serve a master undertakes, as between himself and his master, to run all the ordinary risks of the service, and this includes the risk of negligence upon the part of a fellow servant when he is acting in the discharge of his duty as a servant of him who is the common master of both." The Massachusetts case has become the leading one on the subject in the United States, and the fellow servant doctrine may fairly be taken to be, in the view of the courts, but

a phase or special application of the doctrine of assumed risk, already discussed.

The rule itself is thus formulated by Mr. McKinney in his work on *Fellow Servants*, p. 18: Where a master uses due diligence in the selection of competent and trusty servants, and furnishes them with suitable means to perform the service in which he employs them, he is not answerable to one of them for an injury received by him in consequence of the carelessness of another, while both are engaged in the same service."

The extreme harshness and hardship of this rule when practically applied, has led some courts, notably that of Ohio, to distinguish between fellow servants and "vice-principals," and other courts to require that, if the rule is to operate, the servants shall be personally associated. It is now very generally modified by statute far enough to exclude railroad employees from its scope.

In conclusion, therefore, we may say that there are classes in America, and that the judicial pharisaism which refuses to recognize the fact has wrought cruel deception and bitter injustice. Flattered by meretricious assurances of equality, the working-man has exerted himself to preserve the existing order of things, while his sole asset, his ability to labor, has been made the plaything of judicial subserviency to capitalism. But does the working-man feel aggrieved by this attitude of the courts toward him? (he may not, for his patience is one of the most curious social phenomena of our time)—the remedy lies with himself. This same doctrine of equality which has been thus adroitly used to his undoing, has placed in his hands the ballot, the law making power, before even which courts must bow. Not one of the judicial doctrines here criticised but may be abrogated by half a dozen lines of properly drafted legislation. No constitutional sanction hedges them about, no vested right can be worked in their defense. All that is needed is that the wage earner shall cease to vote for candidates of old parties which are but the political expression of various capitalistic and middle-class interests, and cast an intelligent ballot in his own behalf. No workingman can doubt that a socialist legislature or socialist court would sweep away this entire fabric of subtle injustice with the rapidity of an avenging besom. Does he want to be rid of it? That is the only question.

Clarence Meily.

*Murray v. South Carolina R. Co., 1 McMullan 385; 36 Am. Dec. 268.

†Farwell v. Boston & Worcester R. Corp., 4 Metc. 49.

‡Hutchinson v. Nork, New Castle & Berwick R. Co., 5 Exch. 343; 19 L. J. Exch. 296.

The National Organizing Work.

THE contribution of one thousand dollars by Comrade J. A. Wayland of the *Appeal to Reason* to the National Organizing Fund comes in good season. It comes at a time when most needed and when it can be put to the best uses for the Socialist Party, which is the concrete expression of the Socialist movement in America.

While it is no exaggeration to say that the organizing work carried on by the National Socialist Party during the past eight months has exceeded that performed in any similar length of time before, yet even this was not all that was needed or desired to be done. It is simple enough to inaugurate a work of this kind; the great difficulty comes in continuing it after it has begun. It was quite impossible to satisfy all sections requiring or asking for organizers at once and the same time. The number of organizers employed was not sufficient to go around, the territory to be covered too large, and the resources of the national office too limited. For these reasons many comrades have been disappointed, and in some cases impatience has been manifested at being "neglected" when the national office was doing the best it could. The Quorum and National Committee are more than anxious to promote the organizing work, but they could not do it under the circumstances, however much they desired to.

But the *Appeal to Reason* donation, while not altogether solving the problem, makes the way easier. Upon its receipt the National Secretary submitted to the Quorum propositions which he has long had in mind, for extending the organizing capacity into territory heretofore untouched. These propositions have been approved by the Quorum, and their successful fulfilment will depend upon the comrades in the sections receiving the benefit, as well as upon the party at large.

In brief, the propositions may be outlined as follows:

That Comrade F. E. Seeds of Kentucky, if available, be appointed national organizer for the states of Maryland, West Virginia and North Carolina. Comrade Seeds has had much experience as a party agitator and organizer and is highly recommended to the National Office.

That J. W. Bennett of Iowa, be appointed national organizer for the states of North and South Dakota. Comrade Bennett was recommended by National Committeeman Work some time ago, but no opportunity was presented to use his services.

That P. J. Hyland of Nebraska, if available, be appointed national organizer for Wyoming, and should circumstances permit, for Utah. Comrade Hyland is a fine out-door speaker, and all around hard worker.

That changes be made in routes arranged for organizers already in the field as follows: Bigelow to go from Kansas to Arkansas, and then take Goebel's place in the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, instead of going on through Alabama and Georgia to Florida. Goebel will be confined to Texas and Louisiana until December. Ray will take Bigelow's place in Georgia and Florida, touching also South Carolina on the way. Alabama has already received some valuable attention from the national office, but will be cared for later on. McKee will remain in Arizona until November, and then probably enter Nevada. Wilkins will work in Washington, Montana, Idaho and Oregon. In the East John W. Brown and John Spargo will work in Rhode Island between now and November, assisting in the state campaign. New Hampshire and Vermont will receive attention about December. Delaware will be cared for as opportunity presents. In states not named either financial assistance has been already rendered by the National Committee, or arrangements have been made by the states themselves to support organizers. The Quorum has also voted to place an Italian Organizer in the field in the person of Silvio Origo, and he will make an interstate tour.

In the meantime Comrade Ben Hanford will be continuing his successful lecture tour, which will carry him to the Pacific Coast and back through the Northwestern States. Other lecture tours will also be arranged.

A study of these plans will show that within the next six months every state and territory will have received visits from national organizers or will be supporting organizers of their own. Comrades must bear in mind that every place cannot be visited AT ONCE. The national office cannot assume financial responsibility for any more organizers than it can afford to support. It is most important that the party be kept out of debt. But every place will finally be visited, if the comrades will but realize the immensity of the task we have undertaken and be patient with us.

In this connection it is in order to point out that while the national organizing fund has reached \$1,000 in round figures (apart from the *Appeal* donation) yet this sum has not nearly covered the amount expended by the national office for organizing during the seven months past. IF IT HAD NOT BEEN FOR DUES RECEIVED, the work could not have gone on as it has. The organizing fund has only assisted in starting the work, and without the revenue for dues it could not have been continued.

Besides, the running expenses of the office are steadily on the increase. Supplies are being furnished to affiliated organizations merely at cost, organizers have to be kept supplied, the leaflets "Why Socialists Pay Dues" and "How to Organize" are sent out free, and this means that printing bills must be constantly

met. An additional number of organizers will naturally involve additional expense of all kinds.

The office force is working night and day in order to keep up, but improvements in the method of conducting business are constantly needed. The National Secretary is arranging to fit out the office in thorough manner, so that the business can finally be run systematically and economically. This would have been done before, but some of the old debts are still unpaid, although the next three months will certainly see them wiped out for good.

All this should impress party members with the necessity of, first, paying dues promptly, and, second, subscribing what they can to the National organizing fund. Don't think that Comrade Wayland's donation has equipped us completely for the work of organization. IT HAS ONLY GIVEN US A SPLENDID OPPORTUNITY to become equipped, through organization, for the great battle of next year and the greater ones to follow. Coin cards for donations to the organizing fund will be furnished upon application by the National Secretary.

The objective point to be aimed at at present is to get every state into such a condition that it can support either one organizer, or more, for itself. To accomplish this the National Committee should be left free to carry out its plans through its representatives, and locals and states should render all the assistance possible and practice self dependence and self reliance at the same time. Do not expect too much from the National Office. Especially does this advice apply to the tendency to look to the National Committee for financial assistance for one purpose or another. All the money within reach is needed for conducting the organizing and lecture work.

Finally, let every party member keep in good standing by paying dues promptly and regularly and determine to gain at least one new member every month. By doing this the most effective and surest method will be used to solidify and knit together the revolutionary forces rapidly developing in America into compact organization prepared to enter the national campaign of 1904 to wage a conflict against capitalism which will result in making the Socialist Party the second political party in importance in this country and the leader of the international Socialist movement for working-class emancipation throughout the world.

William Mailly.

National Secretary,

Socialist Party.

The Present Aspect of Political Socialism in England.

MORALLY and intellectually Socialism is on the march; politically it hobbles along, lamely if gamely. I for one cannot conceal from myself a sense of anxiety and foreboding. This sense of disquietude has reference only to the comparatively restricted area of politics. It seems to me that it is time for Socialism to examine the situation. In a sentence, my fear is that unless in the near future we can bring about Socialist consolidation, we may find political socialism effectively sidetracked for a decade or more. The purpose of this article is to attract attention to certain political tendencies dangerous to our movement and to make one or two practical proposals for *Clarion* readers to consider and amend.

These tendencies affect Socialist organizations externally and internally. The first category expresses itself in the present fiscal agitation which is bringing in its train Liberal concentration. The second covers the present organization of the various Socialist bodies, their relation to each other and their joint relation to the Labor Representation Committee. It is obvious that what affects us externally must have vital relation to the inward arrangements of the Socialist groups.

It is now evident that Liberalism has nothing to say to Mr. Chamberlain's new protectionism beyond the blank negative. We all agree that the Chamberlain scheme is heretical and futile. Liberalism sees its chance and already a silent message speeds its course through the constituencies that, at all hazards and at whatever cost, the principles of Free Trade must be asserted. In plain English this means vote for Liberalism. But a blank negative is poor fare for empty bellies. The Liberalists are vehemently asserting that never has Great Britain been so prosperous and that if we revert to the discussion of food (or of imported manufactured goods) we make life unendurable for 30 per cent of the population now living on the verge of poverty. A country is strangely prosperous with 30 per cent of its population poverty stricken. It is precisely this large proportion of under-paid, under-fed, ill-educated fellowmen and women which most deeply concern Socialist propaganda. When, therefore, the Socialist asks the Liberal what are his constructive proposals in regard to this the "least of our brethren" the Liberal replies "Wait, we must first defeat Chamberlain." For two generations this has been the Liberal answer to this question. A question which now, thank heaven, is stern and insistent. "Wait, we must beat Salisbury." "Wait, we must turn out the ineffable Balfour." "Wait, we must unseat arrogant Toryism." It is a wearisome monochord, wait, wait, wait. We search in vain through the speeches

of Rosebery, Campbell-Bannerman, Asquith, Spencer, Grey and John Morley for the slightest indication of any sense of the real meaning of the poverty question. From the Socialist point of view, Liberalism is as barren as the Sahara. When, therefore, because Chamberlain made a foolish proposal, I am asked to vote Liberal and wait for a more convenient season for social reform, I respectfully decline. I shall vote Socialist or not at all.

It is at this point my troubles begin. Has Socialism anything to say to these immediate political problems, and does it possess the requisite political machinery to impress itself upon the electorate? On the first point I affirm that it is Socialism and only Socialism that has any constructive alternative to the shadowy Chamberlain project; on the second point I affirm that it is now practicable to construct the necessary political machinery *if Socialists will but attend to their own affairs.*

Alas, there is the rub. Can we really contend that Socialism asserts its distinctive message in the tumult and clamor of present politics? Is there not an immediate, urgent danger that the movement towards concentration on a Free Trade basis may submerge and nullify the Socialist propaganda of the past ten years? Does it look well for Socialist unity to see prominent Socialist platform men voicing indiscriminate Free Trade economics? It is necessary to remember that negative criticism spells Liberal revival; constructive alternatives spell Socialist consolidation. The Liberals must ultimately fail and deservedly so unless they are prepared with legislation that controls and humanizes our so-called industrial system; if the Socialists follow in the wake of the Liberal flock of downy negations they will inevitably share in the discredit.

In contrast with Liberalism's barren creed now let us see what Socialism has to say to the dominant political question of the hour. We are told that effectively to link up the colonies to the mother country we must tax food, food in general, bread in particular. Observe that the end in view is closer colonial connection; a means to that end is taxation of foodstuffs. This strikes at the very roots of political Socialism. We have something very definite to say on both points. I will take the second point first. The Socialist reply to Chamberlain is surely as constructive and explicit as the Liberal reply is negative and irrelevant. "Tax bread? No, thank you," says Socialism; "but we will make it." Here follows the obvious argument in regard to municipal bakeries, butcheries, and what not. Does the Liberal agree to it? Not in the least. He is as much committed to capitalistic production as the Tory, perhaps more so. Let the Socialist never weary in presenting his own constructive alternative to the Chamberlain proposal to tax bread and I do not fear the result. To the large issues involved in fiscal imperialism not much need be said. Again,

because of fundamental differences in principle, Socialism and Liberalism cannot camp together. To begin with, the Liberals are hopelessly divided, Rosebery and Asquith are Imperialists; they are committed to an arrogant military imperialism; they are in part responsible for the present fiscal proposals. They represent one school of imperialism. Campbell-Bannerman, Harcourt and John Morley are strenuously opposed to this type of Liberalism; they are the Old Guard Manchester, *laissez aller*. The Socialist has neither part nor lot with either faction. Again it is the Socialist who offers a constructive alternative to Chamberlain's fiscal levitation. We are glad enough to bring the colonies nearer to us provided no sound economic laws are contravened. We are glad to bring all countries nearer to us. If events so shape themselves that the centripetal movement first affects the colonies, why then we will take the occasion by the hand. But how? Obviously by seeking to control sea-transit. It is the shipping ring and the adverse freight rate that keep our colonies such a hopeless distance from us. To imperialize (I dislike the word, but there is no other) those shipping lines that connect us with our colonies; to reorganize freight rates on a reasonable basis; to preclude all preferential rates; to control the railway system, as we would control the mercantile marine; to resuscitate our canals—all this is in the direct line of Socialist economics and can only consistently be advocated by Socialists.

Nor must we forget that any constructive system, partial or complete, appreciates rent far beyond the extent of impost. You cannot dodge rent. Have the Liberalists anything to say on the land question? You can cut the silence with a knife.

These then are the very political elements in which Socialists should positively revel. To make bread rather than to tax it; to control transit, both land and sea; to drive home the thousand morals of the land question; all this is fruitful Socialist politics. Are we doing it? A prominent American Socialist asked me the other day if the British Socialists had met to consider these urgent questions. What answer had I not to make ashamed? The truth is we are meekly following the lead of the *Daily News*.

To understand the secret of Socialist political impotence we must look inward as well as outward. Inward into what?

Certainly not into the Socialist Party, because there isn't one.

There are a number of Socialist groups, the I. L. P., S. D. F., Fabian and some isolated local organizations. They are all desperately busy upon their own concerns; the result is that the larger and more prominent interests of Socialism are regarded with Olympian indifference. I have never believed that Socialist concentration, to say nothing of unity, would come from the inside of the Socialist movement. There are too many temperamental clashings to nurse any such hope. Outside pressure, the menace of political extinction, must soon compel definite steps

towards consolidation. If the present Socialist leaders do not realize this, then they must be sent about their business. Our circumstances are becoming too exigent to consider the present susceptibilities.

The first thing to do is to define our attitude towards the Labor Representation Committee. Owing to the chairman's fatuous ruling at the York Conference the I. L. P. has solemnly declared that the only possible basis of Socialist unity is in affiliation with the L. R. C., an avowedly non-Socialist organization. Now this simply would not do; it is too ridiculous. Four of the five L. R. C. members of parliament are hard-shell Liberals. But to be distinctively Socialist in no sense precludes a cordial working arrangement with the trade unions. One of the greatest advantages of the Consolidated Socialist party is that it can be opportunist without sacrifice of principle or misconception. As things are now the I. L. P. is affiliated with the L. R. C., whilst the S. D. F. is not. This creates misconception and tends to irritation. I do not think that as yet there has been any sacrifice of principle on the part of the I. L. P., but it has gone perilously near the margin. Mr. Keir Hardie has now admitted (*Labor Leader*, August 8) that in the affiliation, the members of the I. L. P. deliberately ran the risk of merging their Socialism in vague and indefinable laborism. Personally I feel strongly that no such risk should have been run. Nor do I think it was in the least necessary.

The Taff Vale judgment meant the entrance of trade unionism into active politics. It tore aside all conventional coverings and laid bare that remorseless class struggle, the existence of which Mr. Bruce Glasier complacently denies. The trade unions saw that in this struggle they must fight politically as well as industrially. And in the fight it was the duty and the pleasure of all Socialists to co-operate. But whilst the Socialist seeks to end this class struggle by abolishing private capitalism, the trade unionist as yet accepts the present economic system, seeking ever to better his condition. At the moment he wants to reconstruct trade unionism at the breaches made by judges. I believe that the Liberals will amend the trade union law if they be returned to power. Supposing this to be the case, it is clear to my mind that the trade unions must finally split. Some will support Liberalism out of gratitude; others will realize the economic situation and gradually approach the Socialists. If the trade union movement towards Socialism is to make itself felt, there must be a strong Socialist party to welcome such an army of recruits. By all means let us help the trade unions—we must do so or we belie our principles; but we must establish a truer equipoise in the labor army by consolidating and unifying our Socialist forces.

How is this to be done? Not easily, I grant. Yet there is nothing, absolutely nothing, to divide us. The I. L. P. occupies

a fairly strong strategic position because it has one leg in the trade union camp and the other in the Socialist camp. But there are dangers. Let it beware lest it be torn asunder. Whatever tends to strengthen Socialism must in the nature of things materially strengthen our influences amongst the trade unions. The I. L. P. Leaders would be immeasurably stronger equipped if they voiced the sentiments of a united Socialist party. I frankly confess that why they stubbornly refuse passes my comprehension. The S. D. F. by its rigid adherence to Socialist doctrine pure and undefiled has bred great qualities in its members—qualities that have their inevitable defects. When I hear a body of S. D. F.-ers spontaneously break into the song, "We'll keep the old flag flying yet," I feel a crick in my throat, but my emotions are mixed. There is now ample evidence that the S. D. F. is ready to fall into the line of one Socialist party. Their knowledge of European Socialism urges them towards organic unity. None the less Socialist unity will not come in a day.

I venture to make two proposals, both of which would involve a step in advance. Let the conferences of Socialists be only to consider our attitude towards the Chamberlain scheme. The series of resolutions embracing communal production of food commodities, transit, and the land question would, I believe, give a unified purpose to political Socialism. The executives of the I. L. P., the Fabian Society, might take the business in hand.

My second proposal is of a more delicate character. It relates to the I. L. P. and S. D. F. only. Next year both parties hold their annual conference in different parts of the country; but no arrangements have yet been made for 1905. I suggest that in 1904 both conferences decide to meet in the same town and at the same time in 1905. Let each organization discuss its own affairs at its morning session; let there be joint sessions each afternoon to discuss national politics and, if possible, accept definite resolutions. If this be done—it is quite feasible and commits us to nothing—the next step toward party unity will not be long delayed.

For national reasons; for sectional purposes; to defeat the menace of political extinction; to secure discipline; to co-ordinate our all-too-scanty intellectual resources; to face the actual facts and mould political situations; to do these things needs Socialist consolidation. The time is ripe for Socialists of all complexions frankly to discuss the actual bearing of recent events upon our political efficiency. To conclude, consolidated Socialism spells enhanced political strength; desiccated Socialism means the impotent preaching of those principles crudely expressed.

—S. G. Hobson in *London Clarion*.

The Ferri Criminal.

A MAN in a public library, nowadays, must awaken to the fact that criminals are being studied as they never were before. And if this observing person happens to be a Socialist, he will be pleased to see that Ferri's book, "Criminal Sociology," is considered a standard work, to be given the same honors and shelf as Lombroso, Joly and others.

With scientists who are not conscious of a class struggle, a discussion on criminology can have but little attraction for the Socialist—for it would lack that fundamental unity of opinion which is necessary to right conclusions. But with Comrade Ferri—a class conscious Socialist—there should be no such stumbling block, and we can at least be sure of a starting point of agreement—however much we may disagree with some of his deductions.

In the English translation of his work, edited by Douglas Morrison, Ferri states: "Our task is to show that the basis of every theory concerning the self-defense of the community against evildoers must be the observation of the individual and of society in their criminal activity. In one word, our task is to construct a criminal sociology." (Preface xvi.) And again: "The science of criminal statistics is to criminal sociology what histology is to biology, for it exhibits, in the conditions of the individual elements of the collective organism, the factors of a crime as a social phenomenon. And that not only for scientific inductions, but also for practical and legislative purposes; for, as Lord Brougham said at the London Statistical Congress in 1860, 'Criminal statistics are for the legislator what the chart and compass are for the navigator.'"

From all this it must be plain that Ferri considers the study of criminology, for all practical purposes, to be the study of an exact science. But is it? Is the fountainhead of all the interesting conclusions arrived at by criminologists a well of truth? I refer to their tables of statistics in particular, and their subjects of study in general.

If criminology is a branch of natural history, then nature must have so marked, assorted and labeled certain men that wise professors can place them in their proper jars after a careful analysis. To bear this theory out, Ferri would have us study the skull, the brain, the vital organs, the mental constitution, and the personal characteristics of the criminal. Even the climate, the nature of the soil, the relative length of day and night, the seasons, the average temperature, meteoric conditions and agricultural

pursuits, all, we are told, are physical factors which assist in the determination of the criminal.

If it was from these natural sources alone that Ferri had constructed his criminal, our criticism would never have been born; but from what collection of "criminals" does he observe and deduce the *natural* history of crime? From a collection carefully gotten together by the capitalist class.

In prisons, controlled by the capitalists, Ferri makes scientific observations upon a class of men, women and children who have been put there for breaking capitalist law. And upon what human action has not capitalist law placed its ban?—always excepting the sacred right of accumulating private property. Has it not been said, but a few years ago, that men should burn if they were Protestants, die if they were Catholics, be whipped naked if they were Quakers? And today, does it not convict the Jew and the Seventh Day Adventist who fail to bow down to a Christian Sabbath? Under what law are more men made criminals than under any other? Under that of vagrancy. This law practically allows the arrest and conviction of any one who is without money and without work. Under this law a man, "without visible means of support," can be convicted of a crime for sleeping in a vacant lot (without having obtained permission of the owner), or for refusing to work when work is offered (the possible smallness of the wage offered not being taken into consideration by the law). These "crimes," and other offenses of like import, bring men to jail—there to be measured, analyzed, classified and labeled by the professor of criminology. We appeal to common sense!—is this the way to study natural history? If a goat, a pig, a chicken and a cow were all locked in a barn together, would the natural history student compare their eyes, weigh their brains, study their skins and come to a conclusion that their natures had brought them thus to a common center, constituting a class by themselves? What sort of a composite photograph would be evolved from the blending of this group of animal life? Anything natural?

What is a criminal? According to Ferri he must be a man convicted of a crime. What is a crime? Something that capitalist legislators say is wrong. Think of that!—think of the mob of pot-house politicians that yearly pile up laws in the various state capitals, being nature's classifiers of human life! See them!—the big thieves making laws to protect society against the little thieves! And upon the findings of these lawmakers Ferri bases his scientific conclusions. Here in California we have a law making it criminal to print an article in the newspaper without having the writer's name signed to it—this applies to editors and and all—or to print a caricature. To be sure, this law is a dead letter, otherwise Ferri's table of measurements of criminals' heads would have expanded to a degree.

But let no one think that we would prove all good men in jail and the bad ones out. Undoubtedly there are brutes who find their way to jail, but does the common jail-herd signify a natural selection of human life?—a natural partition of those beings who are a menace to society? No. It is a capitalist selection of subjects that Ferri is studying. Let him look to his figures, his measurements, and his tables, and he will find that a threat against the private ownership of the necessities of life to be the greatest crime on the calendar, and the basic reason for the existence of a "criminal class."

Not only are the laws made by the property holders prejudiced against the propertyless, but even the juries are drawn from this same class. In this state no one may sit upon a jury who is not upon the assessment roll. And through this sieve of justice Ferri expects to see the wheat separated from the chaff—the evildoers from the righteous.

The law of averages is not a thing to play with. Rightly used, its deductions are unquestionable, as, for instance, the mortuary tables of a life insurance company, which shows the average length of life to a fair certainty. But what must we think of a scientific conclusion drawn from such tables of statistics as these prison records? And harder yet of comprehension, how can a Socialist of international reputation accept evidence from the capitalist class upon a matter of such vital importance? Why, the very existence of the capitalists depend upon their providing that these records are a scientific compilation of examinations of the evildoers of society. Are they? Are vagrants, who constitute one of the largest fractions of the imprisoned, a class that threatens the existence of society? These vagrants are on strike—without the organization of a trade union, to be sure, but yet on strike against too much work for too little pay. Will Ferri assert that these men are a menace to society, under present conditions, because they do not work for capitalists? Would he have us believe that if more men went to work for capitalism the world would be better off? Well do the capitalists know that they must prove every man a "criminal" who does not work, night and day, to increase the private ownership of wealth—and hence their laws, their prisons, and their records—all strictly "scientific."

The men who should study these records need not stop to measure heads—it will be enough if they but count noses. For if a poor man becomes a criminal through his poverty—as the vagrancy laws assert—crime is certainly on the increase, and Professor Ferri has come to at least one correct conclusion.

That a study of the imprisoned may result in the unearthing of much valuable data as to lunacy, mental irresponsibility, and a great variety of mono-maniacs, there can be no question, but, aside from this, that criminologists can arrive at scientific conclusions as to who constitute the natural criminal (those who

are a menace to society) we deny. "But," say our criminologists, "we've measured the skulls of all the thieves and murderers and found them to be abnormal." Are you sure you have? Why the capitalists only catch the little thieves and murderers—who are not in the trust—and the lack of wit of this small fry proves absolutely nothing except that they were weak-minded enough to be caught. Have you the measurements of Nero's skull, Napoleon's skull, or that of General Kitchener? None of these men, to be sure, ever bathed their own hands in their victims' blood, but neither does a poisoner. Of course this line of argument will only hold good with a socialist-criminologist (Heaven save the mark), for the orthodox professors probably believe in the divine right of these normal murderers. And then, again, why should we heap all the responsibility onto the generals in the field? There is the Sultan of Turkey and Joseph Chamberlain, both of whom were quite ready to wipe out men, women and children with any weapon that came to their hands. For a strictly scientific conclusion it would seem as if Ferri must yet examine a number of heads.

Now we can see our opponents in this argument ready to take a parting and deadly shot at us: "How do you account," they ask, "for the number of recidivists, the habitual criminals? Is it not proof that this is naturally a criminal class?" To be sure, this question looks like a poser, but after all these "criminals" are affected by the laws of competition. They, too, are living as they can, not as they would. A man is not necessarily insane who returns, again and again, to a place where he is treated like a dog. Day laborers are continually doing this without criminologists labeling them as crazy. These unfortunate pick-and-shovel men know only the tricks of their trade and, every time they hunt a job, find only one avenue open to them. Why even the professors of criminology themselves, if the world should wake up and see the joke of their calculations, would probably continue to recidivate and insist that their mode of getting a living was legitimate. You can't teach an old dog new tricks, he will, quite naturally and normally, recidivate.

Who has not heard of the many heart-rending attempts of "criminals" to make an "honest" living after they have once served time? Hounded by the police, who know that these men can always be arrested, innocent or guilty, when they need a victim to fit the crime, boycotted by the "respectable" citizen and merchants of the community, is it surprising that they return, again and again, to the one trade that they know, to fill their stomachs? This relapse does not necessarily show a diseased individual, but it does show a diseased community of capitalist-ridden fools, who are willing to starve amidst plenty and hunt for "criminals" among chicken thieves and vagrants.

JOHN MURRAY, JR.

EDITORIAL

Crisis in Trade Unions.

The last few months has seen an attack upon union labor along the whole International fighting line. How the Taff Vale decision of England establishing the principle that all unions are liable for any damages incurred to their masters through a strike has been accepted and extended throughout that country is well told by Comrade Max S. Hayes elsewhere in this number. The Employers' Alliance in America, notwithstanding the insane ravings of their spokesman, D. M. Parry, is evidently preparing for a desperate fight. The general strike in Holland precipitated by the capitalists with International assistance, has given the labor movement something of a set back there, while a general reaction seems to have extended through the Australian colonies following the crushing of the railroad unions. All this shows how widespread the battle has become.

Very appropriately, however, the center of the firing line seems to be in the United States, where, as usual, the class struggle is waging fiercer than anywhere else. The last two months have seen a series of concerted moves which would seem to indicate that American capitalists were making a last desperate stand against the attempt of labor to improve its condition, and were determined to crush all attempts at co-operative resistance. Roosevelt, who but a short time ago was posing as the good angel of the coal miners, now announces in the Miller case the principle of the "open shop," a principle absolutely incompatible with successful trades unionism. If trade unionist and scab must work side by side sharing all the benefits, while the unionist alone bears the burdens of the struggle for better conditions, the constant incentive to slip from the burden-bearing into the purely benefit-receiving class will disrupt any union. This will be specially true when we add to the other burdens which the unionist must bear the inevitable discrimination of the employer. All union leaders have recognized these facts, and the hardest battles ever waged by trade unions in this country have been in defense of the principle of the closed shop. The employers have recognized this as a strategic point, and are bending their energies to carry their point. The marble workers have just been locked out by their employers who have announced their determination to open

up only when the union men shall consent to associate and work with their most deadly enemies.

More serious than any of these is the movement in this country to take advantage of the Taff Vale decision. The most important application of this which also involves the extension of the principle as explained by the English courts is seen in the suit by D. Loewe & Co., of Danbury, Connecticut, against the American Federation of Labor and the United Hatters of North America. This suit is for \$350,000 damage and involves the entire question of the right of boycott or even of the use of the union label as a method of discriminating against scab goods.

Another suit involving something of the same principle is that started by John M. Stiles, of Chicago, against practically all the building trade unions, and demanding damages for over \$50,000, because of injuries claimed to have been inflicted upon the complainant through strikes, and the Chicago Candy-makers' Union has also been sued by its employers for \$20,000 on similar ground.

There are numerous other suits, but these are sufficient to show how widespread the movement has become. A publication which comes to us from Vienna as the "central organ of the Austrian employers," appeals to the employers of Austria to stand together with the employers of the whole world in a struggle against the trade union and Socialist movement. It is interesting to note that this holds up as a model the English trade unions, of which it says: "They do not fight against the social order, nor against capital. On the contrary they have always completely surrendered their whole skill, intellectual ability and well-fed bodily strength to the capitalists. They said to themselves, if we wish to eat more beef steak and drink more porter and whiskey, or if we wish to have more days for music or sport, then we must devote our whole intellectual and physical energy to the factories and workshops in which we labor in order to turn out the very best possible products." But it is complained that the English trade unions are no longer maintaining this disposition, but are following the terrible example of their continental brothers and are going into politics. The situation in every country in the world is reviewed, and they cite with admiration the work of the Employers' Association in crushing the strike of the Chicago hotel and restaurant employees, the building trades in New York, and the spinners in Lowell, and praise the work of the employers in Denver in fighting trade unions, from which it would seem that there was a conscious organized co-operation between the employers of the world to fight the trade union movement, and especially when it becomes Socialistic. As the quotation shows, they have little fear of the "pure and simple."

The question of the immediate outcome is one which it is impossible to answer at the present time. Of the ultimate outcome there can be no doubt. The working class is not going to be crushed. Whether unionism in its present form, however, can withstand the struggle is another question. It is certain that if the leaders persist in their ignorant and reactionary opposition to all intelligent use of political power, the union will suffer at

least a temporary defeat. There seems to be a tendency on the part of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor to temporize with the matter even to the extent of neglecting the direct instructions of the rank and file. The political plums that have been gathered by Sargent, Sovereign, Powderly, Madden, Clark and others have evidently caused a hunger and thirst for more political pap. Hence it is that we see the executive committee hesitating whether it shall dare to take a stand against Roosevelt on the "open shop," notwithstanding the fact that with one or two exceptions every trade union in the country is, and always must be, opposed to the idea of union and scab working together. In case these leaders refuse to respond to the new demands that are being made upon them it is pretty safe to say that the movement towards industrialism and independent political action will so gain in strength that the present political leaders will find themselves out of a job.

Never, perhaps, in the face of a great crisis have representatives of the workers shown themselves so contemptible as has the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor at the present time. According to the press reports it was John Mitchell who led the opposition to any criticism of Roosevelt. It would seem that the association with the "great men" of capitalism had had rather a bad effect on Mitchell's head, and that he was now showing himself, if not directly treacherous, at least hopelessly incapable of grasping the situation. If the rank and file of the trade unions of America do not administer a rebuke to such tactics it will indicate that their appetite for oppression has not yet been exhausted.

Just as we go to press comes the news of the formation of the Central Employers' Association in Chicago, including capitalists throughout the entire country. The following from the Chicago Journal tells the inspiration which led to the formation of this institution:

"The spectre of socialism has at last begun to frighten American employers.

"Promoters of the new Central Employers' Association, which is being formed by organizations from the Atlantic to the Pacific, admitted this today, at a conference in Frederick W. Job's office.

" 'If it were not for the growth of socialism,' said A. C. Davis, assistant secretary of the National Manufacturers' Association, 'this association might not have been thought of. The policy of not opposing the movement has failed. We intend to fight socialism as well as the illegal methods and objects of union labor.'

" 'Socialism is the coming question,' declared A. C. Marshall, of the Dayton (Ohio) Employers' Association. 'There is an undercurrent of socialism in all labor unions and this is the great danger of the present time. Far greater than mere unionism. The Catholic Church has been the first to recognize this. Something must be done to check the tide.'..

"Secretary Job, of the Chicago Employers' Association, agreed with the speakers, and J. C. Craig, president of the Citizens' Alliance, of Denver, Colo., told of the conditions in his home state:

" 'Labor organizations in Colorado,' he said, 'are openly socialistic. The Western Federation of Miners, or, as I should call it, "The Western

Federation of Murderers," is full of socialist agitators. So is the Western Labor Union, and the citizens are banding together to resist their aggressions. Our association has 14,000 members in Denver and many other similar organizations have been formed. We intend to promote law and order and uphold the constitution of the United States.'

"Another speaker pointed out the fact that the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor had recently adopted socialistic resolutions and declared for 'industrial democracy.'

"The fight of the new employers' organization against the unreasonable exactions of unions and the influx of the doctrines of Karl Marx and other extremists will be fiercely waged.

"A publication is to be established for discussion of the problems involved, in which the present state of society and the laws will be vigorously upheld.

"A bureau of education and organization will also be formed."

This marks but one more step in the process of organization by the capitalists and offers one more proof that socialism is the one thing they most fear. In the Chicago Chronicle report of the same meeting another phase of the subject is brought out which should be called to the attention of the trade unionists throughout the country. The Mr. Craig referred to above is quoted as saying:

"The American Labor Union and the Western Miners must go. Both organizations have reached the point where they are dangerous to the community at large. They are lawless aggregations, teeming with socialists and anarchists. They do no good to labor and have an astounding record of crime and murder. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, I regard as a comparatively conservative man, and the employers of the west would be glad to see him succeed in extending the control of the American Federation throughout the west."

That Gompers will permit himself to be used in the manner suggested is perhaps too severe an indictment to bring against even one who has shown as great subserviency to capitalism as he has. The fact, however, of his recommendation by such a man should serve to awaken the members of the Federation of Labor to the necessity of supplanting him with some one who really recognizes the interests of the working class.

The Situation in Nebraska.

A communication has just been sent out by the State quorum of Nebraska discussing the situation in that State. The communication, as a whole, is too long for our columns, and we have made it a general rule not to publish communications of so purely a factional character as this seems to be, yet there are many things in it which we believe are of importance to the members at large, and that justice to the Nebraska comrades

requires should be published. It appears that the Socialist movement in Nebraska had a most unsavory origin, being started by a body of grafters in pay of the Republican party. As soon, however, as it began to have anything of a working class membership these men were driven out. Many of them, however, are still concerned in the organization of the "Omaha Socialist Propaganda Club," concerning which there has been so much discussion in the Socialist press. It was this organization, under whose auspices Comrades Mills and Hagerty spoke. The regular Socialist local protests that it invited speakers representing all phases of the recognized Socialist movement and that, therefore, there was no reason for the existence of such a propaganda club, and that its influence in the movement is purely disruptive. It appears that several comrades have come from other States into Nebraska and engaged in propaganda work without consulting the party organization. It is complained that such work tends to disorganize the movement, and accordingly the State quorum calls for action by the national committee to prevent further action along this line.

The communication is signed by the following: Parker S. Condit, chairman; G. W. Wray, B. McCaffrey, P. J. Hyland, J. Alfred LaBille, J. P. Roe, State Secretary.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

The International Socialist Bureau at Brussels has published a call to the party organizations of all countries inviting participation in the coming International Congress which takes place at Amsterdam August 14-20, 1904. The different parties are requested to bring the matter up before their coming congresses or conventions. The subject for discussion as far as determined on are as follows:

1. The Report of Secretary.
2. The Report of Nationalities.
3. General Fundamentals of Socialist Politics.
4. General Strike.
5. Labor Unions and Politics.
6. Trusts and the Unemployed.
7. International Arbitration.
8. Emigration and Immigration.

This order of business is still provisional, the divisions of the party have the right to suggest further points, but these should all be sent in before the 1st of next December.

The various Socialist parties and the central organizations of Trades Unions are requested to send to the Secretary previous to December 31, reports of their activity since the last congress of 1900. The address of the Secretary is No. 63 Rue Heyvaert, Brussels, Belgium.

Germany

Once more the revisionists have pushed themselves into public attention, and in a most unfortunate manner, on the question of whether the Social Democratic Party should seek to have one of its members elected to the Vice-Presidency of the Reichstag. As this is treated quite fully elsewhere in this number little need be said about it here. The whole question is also discussed in an article by August Bebel, of about 10,000 words length, in the *Neue Zeit* for September 5. In this article the whole Bernsteinian position is gone over and its weakness and dangers exposed in a most thorough manner. In his original article which started the trouble Bernstein declared that the Prussian constitution was a democratically adopted document. Bebel declares that this statement would have made old Bismarck hold his sides with laughter and refers Bernstein to an article by his uncle, Aaron Bernstein, written at the time of the adoption of the constitution in which he says of that document that it "is such an unfortunate, crazy, foolish, garbled document that its equal cannot be found in the whole history of law making." In his desperate attempt to defend his position Bernstein had stated that the attendance at court of a Social Democrat would be an indication that the emperor was forced to bow before the revolutionary Socialist movement. This at once angered his bourgeois

adversaries, and they sat upon him with only a little less vehemence than the Socialists. Bebel, with masterly logic and sarcasm, exposes the ridiculousness of the whole question in that the moment a Socialist Vice-President should attempt to do anything of importance for Socialism, or should even neglect to call for a "Hurrah" for the emperor when he entered the chamber, he would be deposed and the whole farce would be played out. He shows how in this discussion the opportunists have completely reversed many of their former positions, so that Vollmar, for example, now declares that the form of the state is of no importance, offering this as an excuse for his advocacy of the court visit and consequent crawling before the emperor. Bebel contrasts the autocratic tyrannical attitude of the German government with other governments of Europe, points out the repression of the rights of free speech, assembly and press, and then asks if it is because of these especial features that a Social Democratic should "Kotow to the emperor." Some of the Opportunists have even dared to suggest that if Singer was not acceptable to the capitalist majority that some other comrade be chosen, thus showing a willingness to let the enemy even select the representatives of the Socialists.

On the whole, the result of this latest expression of Bernsteinism has been to give the Opportunists such a rebuke as they have never before received.

The result at the Dresden congress is familiar to most of our readers. In a masterly speech of over four hours Bebel completely demolished the Opportunist position. Vollmar contented himself with a personal attack on Bebel, alleging that he wished to become the dictator of his party. A resolution was adopted by an almost unanimous vote re-affirming the revolutionary position of the party and denouncing the idea of electing a Vice-President to the Reichstag, or in any other way compromising Socialist principles. A full report of the proceedings will appear in our next issue.

The report of the party officials to the Dresden Congress has just been issued as a supplement to *Vorwaerts*, and is a most interesting and instructive document. The long list of dead to whom honor is paid in the opening pages brings to the mind at once the fact that the party has now reached an age where the first generation of veterans are being mustered out by death. The police outrages of the past year are enumerated, and in the stories of meetings violently dispersed, offices searched and comrades imprisoned we gain a glimpse of the difficulties under which the propagandist of Socialism in Germany must struggle. The total fines registered during the year for Socialist activity amount to 16,707 marks, while the total of sentences to imprisonment amount to fourteen years in the penitentiary and thirty-six years, five months and six weeks jail confinement.

Every year the participation in the minor elections increases until now candidates are nominated for most of the municipal and minor legislative bodies. Consequently the number of socialists elected to these bodies is rapidly increasing. The Social Democratic fraction in the Berlin council has appointed a committee to organize the municipal officers in the province of Brandenburg into a body for the purpose of evolving a municipal program. They have also taken some steps to secure the co-operation of all the municipal officers in Prussia, but the general council of the Prussian wing of the party deferred action owing to the fact that the whole matter of a general municipal program was to be considered at the Dresden Congress.

The report on the work done during the campaign is of especial interest, as giving some view of the causes of the tremendous progress made at the last election. The balance sheet of the party shows that 635,053.58 marks (nearly \$160,000) were handled during the year, and that at the close of the campaign 28,102.84 marks remained on hand. The principal campaign document was the manifesto issued by the Reichstag fraction (a translation of which has already appeared in this department) of which 632,800 copies were circulated. A campaign handbook for the benefit of speakers and

workers was published and 4,500 copies circulated. Large as these figures are, they are probably smaller than would be circulated in a national campaign in the United States with a much smaller membership and vote. In the circulation of periodicals also the comparison is decidedly favorable to us. *Vorwaerts*, to be sure, heads the list with a daily circulation of 78,500, but the *Neue Zeit* falls far behind the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, having only 3,850 circulation, while there are no weekly or monthly propaganda papers with anything near the circulation of some American Socialist papers. *Der Wahre Jacob*, a comic illustrated weekly, brought a profit to the party of 24,666 marks, which more than offset the loss on *Die Neue Zeit* and *Gleichheit*. The latter publication is designed especially for circulation among women and issued special editions of 7,000 each during the campaign, and has a regular circulation of 1,500 copies. *Vorwaerts* brought in a profit of 72,338.65 marks, of which 31,286.58 marks were used to meet deficits on other papers.

From the *National Zeitung*, of Berlin, we learn that the trade unions affiliated with the Social Democratic Party have increased in membership from 677,510 in 1901, to 733,206 at the present time. In 1893 they had only 223,540 members and there was little increase until 1897. Since that year, however, the growth has been steady and rapid. These Social Democratic unions include at least 14.42 per cent of all the workers engaged in the branches represented. In some of the better organized trades practically all the laborers are included.

Italy

Some time ago Enrico Ferri, as editor of the *Avanti*, published an exposure of the corruption existing in the Navy Department. In this article he showed, among other things, that the common soldiers and sailors had been left to suffer with insufficient food and no pay because the money intended for this purpose had been pocketed by the commanding officers. The article forced the resignation of the Minister of the Navy, and was followed by a suit for libel against Ferri as responsible editor for the *Avanti*. The suit has just come to trial, and the thirty-five complainants who appeared in court were informed that since the article referred only to a "system of corruption in the Navy Department" and mentioned no names, there was no official reason for believing that the thirty-five complainants represented the navy, or were a part of the system of corruption, consequently the case was dismissed.

This outcome of the case was wholly unexpected and undesired by Ferri, as he had come into court wholly prepared to prove his charges. Doubtless it was a knowledge of this fact that led to the dismissal of the case.

The split in the Socialist Party in Italy seems to be rather widening than otherwise. A weekly paper entitled *Il Socialisti* has been started by the reform wing in Rome with Bissolati, Cassola and Monomi as editors. These men were the previous editors of *Avanti*, who were displaced when the party disavowed their reform tactics. They announce their intention, however, of not taking part in the internal fight, but confining themselves to propaganda work.

Norway

There will be five Social Democrats in the new Storting. The total Social Democratic vote at the election of September 3 was 14,046 in those cities from which returns have already been received. In the previous Storting election in 1900 there were only 7,013 Social Democratic

votes. The *Vorwaerts* report states that it is probable that with the elections that are yet to be held that the present number of votes will be doubled.

Later information states that 25,000 Socialist votes were given at the last general election in Norway for the Storting. As a comparison it may be observed that there are at present ten Socialists in the Folkthing in Denmark and four Socialist members of the Riksting in Sweden.

Russia

In spite of the close censorship, rumbles of the tremendous class struggle which is taking place in the heart of this great empire reaches the outside world. The press reports state that over 25,000 men have been out on strike in the neighborhood of Odessa during the past few weeks, and the usual scenes of military abuse, the atrocities of the Cossacks and the wholesale imprisonment of workers have taken place. It is significant that in one case where the troops were ordered to fire upon the strikers the lieutenant stepped forward and told his men that they were laborers like those upon whom they were called upon to shoot, and advised them not to fire. It is needless to say that this officer was at once shot, and it is said that the Czar showed more than ordinary haste in signing the order for his execution. It is to be hoped that the Russian comrades may find some way of letting the outside world know the name of this martyr to the cause of Socialism, that it may be enrolled with the already long list of those who have given up their lives to the cause.

It is extremely significant that one of the directors of the police department in Odessa, in the course of his statements to the strikers, declaring that there should be no concessions made to them, advises them to read the works of Edward Bernstein, whom he asserts to be "an undoubted true friend of the laboring class."

Bernstein declares in a letter to *Vorwaerts* that only a portion of his *Voraussetzung* was allowed to pass the Russian censor, and that all reference to Socialism was cut out in this portion.

The special correspondent of *L'Action* (Paris) reports that the revolutionary activity in the neighborhood of Cracow has just reached a height never before known. The soldiers have received orders to be particularly severe in suppressing all extension of the revolutionary propaganda, and all correspondence coming from this region is subjected to a most severe censorship. Nevertheless the revolution proceeds rapidly, in spite of the bloody path which it leaves behind it. There has scarcely a day passed for some time in the industrial centers that the Cossacks have not killed from 250 to 300 workers. The movement in the vicinity of Cracow is directed by the students of the University, who go into the neighboring villages, at the peril of their lives, in order to preach revolt. The principal revolutionary centers are Cracow, Odessa, Kief, Batoun and Bakou. In the little villages the situation is particularly serious. On the 3d of last July 16,000 workers had gone on a strike, all business connected with the refining and shipping of petroleum, of which Bakou is the center, was suspended, the trains ceased to run and the electric lights, which were used for lighting the city, were unable to be operated. The entire country was at once filled with the military, but at the last report industry was still very much disturbed while the revolutionary movement is spreading to other localities.

Finland

The Finnish Workers' Party, as the Socialist Party of Finland is called, held its convention August 17-20 in Forssa, a small industrial city. Forty branches sent delegates. The party has 59 branches and about 10,000 members.

The government district secretary and several gendarmes and policemen watched over the meeting.

The convention unanimously adopted a party platform, of which the following is a condensation: The Socialist Party of Finland, like the Socialist Parties in other countries, strives to liberate the whole people from the fetters of economic dependence and from political and mental subjection. Among the party's immediate demands are universal equal suffrage for all Finnish men and women who have reached the age of 21, in municipal and national elections; one house of parliament; complete liberty of association, assemblage, speech, and the press; compulsory education, free instruction in all educational institutions.

A municipal program, similar to that in other countries, was adopted.

A suffrage resolution was passed: "The party declares the struggle for suffrage begun and appeals to the workers and just persons of the higher classes to take part energetically in the conflict. If all other means fail a general strike will be declared to obtain universal suffrage."

The convention discussed the question of co-operation. There are from 40 to 50 co-operatives who members are nearly all workers. A resolution was passed that as the workers support the co-operatives the co-operatives should also support the Labor Party.

An agrarian program, including collective ownership of land, was adopted.

The following demands were made: An effective law protecting women, the election of women factory inspectors, old age government pensions going into effect at the age of 55, prevention of disoccupation by establishing the eight-hour day insurance against disoccupation, a minimum limit of wages, state and municipal public works for the unemployed, agricultural colonies, etc.

The next convention will be held in August, 1905.

Edward Walgas, of Helsingfors, and J. K. Kari, of Abo, were elected delegates to the International Socialist Bureau in Brussels. The party executive committee consists of nineteen members, seven of whom live in Abo. The party headquarters are in Abo. The president of the party is T. Tainio; Seth Heikkilae is vice president, and J. K. Kari is secretary and treasurer.—Berlin "Vorwaerts."

Servia

La Petite Republique announces the formation of a Socialist Party in Servia. The dispatch states that this has been impossible hitherto, but that the new king offers no opposition. Five hundred persons were present at the first meeting and arrangements were made for the drawing up of a platform and plan of organization of the party. Later Associated Press reports state that an election held for the Skupshtina (the legislative chamber) on September 22, resulted in the election of 65 "extreme radicals," 78 radicals, 15 liberals and 2 Socialists.

Denmark

The progress of Socialism in Denmark is steady and continuous. The telegraphic dispatches announce that at the municipal election just held in Copenhagen the Socialists were victorious, in spite of a coalition of all other parties. The following, taken from an article by J. Arthur Fal-lows, in the *I. L. P. News* tells the story of the rejection of all compromise tactics by the Danish Socialists and their appearance as a wholly independent body:

"In Denmark there is one compact centralized Socialist party, which contains most of the members of the working classes in the large towns, who are also almost invariably members of Trades Unions. The work-ingmen buy and read the daily Socialist papers, especially the *Social Democrat*. They meet at the Socialist clubs on week nights, and on Sundays at suburban restaurants, where they hold open-air meetings in the summer and indoors in the winter. In the City Council of the capital, Copenhagen, there are now 19 Socialists, out of a total membership of 42. Elections cost very little, and the candidates do not have to pay a single penny thereon. The elected members meet weekly. As in England, the subjects discussed include housing, tramways, wages, early closing of shops, and so forth. In the Danish City Councils there are four official mayors, who are salaried heads of executive depart-ments, and hold office for life. A year ago the Socialist party managed to elect members of their organization as mayor and deputy-mayor. This led to a great agitation among the bourgeoisie, who coalesced in "The Anti-Socialist party," and won several seats from the Socialists.

"The last Socialist congress marked an epoch in the history of the Danish Socialist movement, because of its decision to put an end to the partial alliance with the Liberals which had previously been in effect. This alliance was formed at the time when both the Liberals and the Socialists, as minority and opposition parties, were arrayed against an extremely arbitrary Conservative government, which was determined to hold on to power after it had lost its majority in the Folkething. Two years ago the government was compelled to yield, and a Liberal ministry was formed, and the Socialists in the Folkething gave their support to this ministry in consideration of its promise of considerable reforms—reduction of the war budget, an extensive program of ameliorative labor legislation, extension of manhood suffrage to local elections (for in Denmark, as in most European countries, the suffrage is much more restricted in municipal and communal than in national elections), and other progressive measures.

"Instead, however, of carrying out this program, the Liberal gov-ernment began at once to follow the example of the Conservative min-istry that had preceded it, completely disregarding its pledges, effected a rapprochement with the Conservative majority in the upper house to carry out its reactionary plans in defiance of the opposition in the popular branch.

"In consequence of this experience the party congress unanimously voted to dissolve the alliance and to treat the Liberals on the same terms with the Conservatives, as political enemies. On this line the recent election was fought and a noteworthy advance made for Social Democracy. In the manifesto announcing this change of policy the party declared: 'We do not regret having aided the left to get into power. We foresaw that after the victory of the majority' (that is, the Liberal-Socialist coalition) 'a new conflict would arise within that majority, al-though we did not expect that it would rise so quickly or in such a severe form.'"

England

The article by Comrade Hobson, published elsewhere in this issue, gives a very good view of the present Socialist situation in England. But a few words of explanation regarding some things not touched upon by him will assist in clearing up the matter. It is now evident that a Parliamentary election cannot be long postponed and the Socialists are making their nominations for this election. The S. D. F. has placed H. M. Hyndman in nomination for the district of Burnley and the most strenuous efforts are being made to elect him. There is every prospect of success and it will be a disgrace to the laboring men of England should he fail. There is perhaps no other man in the whole international Socialist movement who could do more in a legislative body than Comrade Hyndman could do in the House of Parliament. He has been recognized for years as one of the ablest students of English political affairs. He is a splendid speaker, a man of undoubted integrity and devotion to the working class.

The general situation in England, however, cannot be said to be encouraging. The Labor Representation Conference, about which we hear so much, because it has nearly a million and a half of trade unionists supporting it with regular contributions for political purposes, is, after all, not a Socialist body. Whether it will evolve into a Socialist organization or not, remains to be seen. The Social Democratic Federation has withdrawn from the Labor Representation Conference, because of its refusal to stand upon a Socialist platform.

The members who have been elected by the L. R. C. to Parliament have, by no means, all been Socialists. Some of them have openly disavowed Socialism after election; others show much more willingness to affiliate with the Liberals than with the Socialists, notwithstanding the fact that the one thing upon which the L. R. C. rests is independent political action.

British Columbia

Associated Press dispatches announce that two, and perhaps three, members have been elected from British Columbia. This gives the Socialists a balance of power in the legislative bodies, and under a Parliamentary government this means that it will be impossible to conduct business, and, consequently, a new election will have to be ordered shortly. The growth of Socialism in Canada has been remarkable. The American Labor Union is very strong in British Columbia and its members are, almost without exception, Socialists.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Political History of Slavery, by William Henry Smith; E. P. Putnam's Sons. Cloth, 2 vols., 806pp.; \$4.50.

The majority of the histories of slavery in America were written by participants in the struggle, lacked historical value and were tinged with extreme partisanship. The present work, to some degree, avoids the first of these defects, but with regard to the second point, the bias is almost as evident in this as in any of the contemporaneous works.

The fundamental proposition of the work is that the Republican party could do no wrong. Once, however, having recognized this position, it is easy for the reader to make allowance, and the author has certainly brought together much new material and co-ordinated it in better form than in any preceding history. The most distinctive feature about the work is the scanty recognition which is given to the early abolitionists of the Garrison-Phillips type, and the much greater importance assigned to western factors. There is no doubt but what this is the trend at the present time, and that it is justifiable. There is little recognition of the economic factors that lay back of the great movement he is describing, and almost no notice of the divergent interests of the economic classes which were struggling for mastery. He does bring out much plainer than ever before the fact that the war was not waged for the abolition of slavery. He repeatedly calls attention to the fact that the Republican party was not abolitionist. He shows how during the war the seaboard states, which were largely commercial, desired above everything, to secure a compromise with the South.

The chapter on "Proposed Concessions" is perhaps the one which is most valuable on this point. Here, it is shown that the Republican senators were all willing, even after the Southern States had seceded, to adopt a constitutional amendment "prohibiting congress from abolishing or interfering with slavery in the States." And an amendment was actually passed through congress to this effect. Finally, after the battle of Bull Run, a resolution was introduced into Congress declaring "that this war is not waged.....for any purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States." "In the House there were only two votes in the negative; in the Senate there were four votes against it cast by dis-unionists."

In the chapter treating of the re-arrangement of affairs after the war, it is pointed out quite clearly how capital gathered into great aggregations, owing to the abnormal conditions of government contracts and the high tariff made necessary by the war.

It would be very easy to go through the book and point out any number of places where the author had refused to see any truth that did not accord with the accepted codes of capitalist ethics. But until the class nature of our present social thought has been transformed, these defects will be common to all books of this character.

Loan Credit in Modern Business, by Thorstein B. Veblen. Reprinted

from Vol. IV., of the Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago. Folio. paper, 22pp.

It is always difficult in Professor Veblen's work to determine in just how far he is poking fun at the orthodox political economist. He announces in regard to this study that "the subject of this inquiry is the resort to credit as an expedient in the quest of profits." He shows that competition forces every capitalist to increase the size of the business turnover by the use of as great credit as possible. This was originally done by loans and current bills. When these could not be met they were said to be "excessive." If these cases included a large number of firms, the resulting liquidation became a crisis.

Professor Veblen points out that the only canon of judgment to determine whether credit was "excessive" was whether the debtor became bankrupt or not.

With modern corporations this credit extension is pushed to its fullest limit at the time of the organization of the company, instead of being a process drawn out through many years. Or, as he puts it, to be "carried out thoroughly it places virtually the entire capital, comprising the whole of the material equipment, on a credit basis. Stock being issued by the use of funds, such funds as may be needed to *pay for printing*, a road will be built, or an industrial plant established, by the use of funds drawn from the sale of bonds; preferred stock or similar debentures will then be issued, commonly of various denominations, to the full amount that the property will bear, and not infrequently somewhat in excess of what the property will bear." [Italics ours.]

One cannot but think that Professor Veblen must have smiled when he wrote such a paragraph as this: "In the ideal case, where a corporation is financed with *due perspicacity*, there will be but an inappreciable proportion of the market value of the company's good will left uncovered by debentures."

In a note he casts some rather suggestive remarks at "the student who harks back to archaic methods for a norm of what capitalism should be." He shows that once a corporation is financed by this method, it is easy to clear out the holders of "excessive credit" and in this way the trust maker is in some respects a substitute for a commercial crisis.

The whole essay, however, is certainly the most keen analysis of modern trust financiering that has ever been published, and will repay reading to any student of this phase of industry.

Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society. By Richard T. Ely. The Macmillan Co. Citizens' Library. pp. 497. \$1.25.

In this work we have for the first time set forth something approaching a social system by an opponent, although almost a friendly one, of socialism. In the first part, which consists of a general survey, the author shows how the idea of evolution in society has arisen, and traces the stages through which society has passed in much the same manner that the socialist does. He gives much valuable statistical material concerning present conditions and the recent tendency of industrial evolution.

The second part, which deals with some special problems of industrial evolution, is a series of essays on various subjects. The author states his problem on page 270 to be "what can we accomplish in order to ameliorate the condition of the masses without departure from the fundamental principles of the existing social order." And it is plain to be seen throughout the whole book that the spectre of socialism is ever before him, and that he is constantly asking himself "what shall we do to be saved?"

He admits that the foresight of Marx and Engels concerning the industrial evolution was almost marvellously prophetic, and that we are approaching the fulfillment of the final stages of that prophecy. He thinks it still possible to maintain the competitive system and so patch up things

as to make conditions endurable without disturbing "the fundamental principles of the existing social order," yet somehow the work fails to carry conviction.

No one can deny the scholarly character of most of its pages, and it is in our opinion one of the most valuable contributions to social thought that has been produced in many years. At the same time whenever the subject of socialism is approached the treatment is most unsatisfactory. This is not because he does not agree with the socialist, but because he seems to constantly avoid coming to an open issue.

There is a section entitled "economic classes," to which we turned with the expectation of finding a fair statement of the socialist theory of the class struggle with the refutation, or at least the attempted refutation, of that position. We do find the well known quotation from the Communist Manifesto beginning with "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles," but having thus given the statement we look in vain for any comment. On the contrary, we find that the great social classification of the Manifesto is given as if it were simply one of several equally important classifications that might be made, and the author even places as apparently co-ordinate with it, the statement that "we may divide the workers according to their kind of occupation," and then follow a few commonplaces such as "The effects of classes are both good and evil."

There is no recognition of the tremendous social significance of the principles laid down in the Manifesto as quoted, if they are true, or any attempt to refute them if the author considers them false.

The same feeling of unfairness arises in the treatment of economic determinism. Here the statement is made that the socialist exaggerates the importance of the economic factor, and an example of such exaggeration is given by a quotation from an article by May Wood Simons which appeared in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. Unfortunately, however, the example, which is instanced as an exaggeration, is almost identical in statement with the position of Prof. Seligman, who is quoted in the same note as having stated the theory in so mild a form that "it is difficult to see why the doctrine should have roused so much discussion." (See Seligman's "Economic Interpretation of History," p. 9.) But no attempt is made to support this opinion of socialist exaggeration, notwithstanding that this is the most crucial point in the whole discussion.

It would be easy to multiply instances of this, but we will give only one more, and that because it applies to the criticism of an article by the reviewer. In his discussion of the contrast between socialism and social reform he quotes an article written by the editor of this REVIEW on "Special Privileges," which, if correct, is a refutation of the whole position on which the book rests. When we saw this we expected at once that some attempt would be made to overthrow the arguments there made. On the contrary Dr. Ely contents himself simply by stating that he believes to the contrary, but offers no reasons for that belief.

It is such quotations as the following, however, that make the socialist smile: "If there is to be a new social order there is every indication that it will be socialism." "If we let things alone we shall have an evolution much like that which the great socialists Marx and Engels predicted."

The whole first part of the book is filled with proofs of the fact that society is evolving, and that new social orders are continually succeeding to the old, and therefore we may be sure that there will be a new social order. In the second place there is a vast body of workingmen who are not only not going to "let things alone," but are going to assist them in moving toward "an evolution like that which Marx and Engels predicted."

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

What to Read on Socialism.

A booklet bearing this title and containing brief descriptions of the standard books on Socialism was published from this office last year, and fifty thousand copies have been circulated. The growth of our publishing house and the number of new books in preparation have now made the booklet out of date, and no more copies will be printed. Its place will be taken by a larger book under the same title. It will be of 36 pages, the size of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, and will contain portraits of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht, Vandervelde, Whitman, Carpenter, Blatchford, Simons, and other writers. There will be an introductory essay by Charles H. Kerr on "The Central Thing in Socialism," explaining in as simple language as possible the principle of Historical Materialism, as developed by Marx, Engels and Labriola, which lies at the foundation of scientific socialism. The body of the book is taken up with descriptions of all the best books on Socialism which are available for American readers, with quotations from many of the more important works. It will be printed on fine book paper, with cover of white enamel, equal in appearance to a ten-cent book, but it will be sold for one cent a copy or \$1.00 a hundred, postpaid, or fifty cents a hundred by express at purchaser's expense. This is less than cost, and on this book there will be no reduction to stockholders.

CAPITAL, BY KARL MARX.

A new importation of the London edition of Marx's Capital has just been received, and it is selling so rapidly that it will be nearly exhausted by the time this issue of the Review is in the hands of its readers. A large order has been placed, and we shall soon be in a position to supply the book as rapidly as it is called for. The phenomenal sale of "Capital" is a good index to the growth of the Socialist movement in the United States.

A non-Socialist publishing house in New York has inserted in some Socialist papers a misleading advertisement of a cheap reprint of "Capital." The fact of the matter is that the London edition contains 847 octavo pages of clear, open type, and was printed from plates which were revised and corrected with the minutest care, under the supervision of Frederick Engels himself. The New York edition is a hasty reprint from the London edition, and it is crowded into less than 600 pages, the lines being close together, and thus much harder on the eyes. The inferior edition sells for \$1.75, while ours sells for \$2.00 at retail, \$1.20 to our stockholders, if mailed, and \$1.00 to stockholders if sent by express at expense of purchaser.

A NEW EDITION OF "THE AMERICAN FARMER.

The American Farmer, by A. M. Simons, is a pioneer work in an untouched field, the application of the principles of Socialism to the social and political questions affecting the farmers of the United States. The first edition of two thousand copies appeared a little over a year ago and is exhausted. The author has been studying the subject constantly during the past year, and has brought so much more material to light that it has seemed best to rewrite the entire book instead of printing an edition from the old plates. Nearly every chapter will be found in the new edition to be materially improved, and so much so that those who have read the first edition will find it necessary to read the second, if they wish to keep up with the subject. Ready about November 10; cloth, 50 cents.

LABRIOLA'S GREAT BOOK.

"Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History," by Professor Labriola, of the University of Rome, is recognized by European socialists as the most important work which has appeared since Capital. Charles H. Kerr has completed a translation of this book, which will be ready about Dec. 1. It will contain about 300 pages, will be handsomely printed and bound, and will sell for \$1.00, with the usual discounts to stockholders. Advance orders are solicited.

THE POCKET LIBRARY OF SOCIALISM.

"The Capitalists' Union or Labor Unions, Which?" is a new booklet of 32 pages, prepared under the authority of Union 7386, American Federation of Labor, for affiliated unions. It is No. 40 of the Pocket Library of Socialism, but the word Socialism is purposely left off the front page, for the reason that the booklet is addressed to the union man who is not a Socialist, and who is probably prejudiced against Socialism, and the idea is to interest in him certain well-understood facts that concern his immediate interests, before leading up to the subject of socialism. The principles of Socialism are set forth, ably, clearly and uncompromisingly, in the latter part of the booklet.

"The Socialist Party," No. 33 of the Pocket Library, has been reissued in an improved form. The descriptions of socialist literature are omitted, since they are given more completely in the new book "What to Read on Socialism." Their place is supplied by a complete directory of the socialist locals of the United States with their secretaries. The compilation of this list involved great labor and expense, and was only made possible by the co-operation of the national and state secretaries. The price has been left at the low uniform figure charged for any issue or for assorted issues of the Pocket Library of Socialism; five cents singly, six for twenty-five cents, fourteen for fifty cents, thirty for a dollar, \$1.33 for the complete set of thirty numbers. To stockholders, two cents a copy for any number less than a hundred, one dollar a hundred, by mail or express, prepaid; eight dollars a thousand by express at the expense of the purchaser.

ALL BUT DELAWARE AND NEVADA.

We received a stock subscription in September from the Socialist Party local at Columbia, South Carolina. We now have a stockholder in every state of the union, except Delaware and Nevada, also in every territory, besides several provinces of Canada and several foreign countries, including England, Scotland, Mexico and Cuba. Less than two hundred shares remain for sale, and it will soon be necessary to take a vote of the stockholders authorizing the issue of additional stock. No

one will hereafter be requested to subscribe for more than a single share, since it is desired to keep the future control of this co-operative publishing company in the hands of the rank and file of the Socialist Party, and not of any individual or small group of individuals.

REMOVAL TO LARGER QUARTERS.

The office of our company since 1895 has been on the fourth floor of the Garden City block, 56 Fifth avenue. The recent growth of our work has crowded our rooms to overflowing, and we have now taken the lease of suite 504-505 on the fifth floor of the same building, giving us double our former space. This will enable us to display our literature in much better shape for the convenience of comrades visiting us. Our post-office address will be as before, Charles H. Kerr & Company, Publishers, 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

A SOCIALIST CLASSIC



THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, Private Property and the State

By FREDERICK ENGELS.

Translated by Ernst Untermann.

There are a few books the reading of which constitutes a necessary foundation to an understanding of Socialism. One of these is Engels' "Origin of the Family." Hitherto this has not been accessible in English, although it has long been translated into almost every other European language.

It deals with fundamentals and traces the growth of those social institutions which are to the student of society what elements are to the chemist. Yet it is written in plain language easily understandable without the knowledge of any technical vocabulary.

It starts with the beginnings of human life and traces the institution of the family, of private property and the state from their first rude origins to their present forms, showing the great changes that have taken place in response to economic transformations.

As a study in Socialist philosophy of institutions, as a storehouse of information on fundamental points, there is no book of anything near the same size that can begin to rival it.

CLOTH, 218 PAGES, 50 CENTS POSTPAID.

**Charles H. Kerr & Company, Publishers,
56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.**